

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the ages past, enable us to abhor that which is evil and cleave to that which is good. Thus may we hasten the extension of Thy kingdom in human minds and hearts. We fervently pray that it may grow and become wide-spread wheresoever man is found. O keep us this day without sin, and may we experience in our own hearts the triumph of good over evil. Grant, our Heavenly Father, that our entire citizenship may be so united, so closely and fraternally bound together that war, strife, or rebellion among us may be forever impossible. Keep us, merciful God, in the peaceful, quiet, and happy pursuits of life which bless those who wait upon the Lord. O God, may the sword of enmity, the sting of envy, or the sharp weapon of hatred never put their cruel and destructive edges to our souls. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 21, 1934, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5075. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1910, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8471) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, numbered 6, 12, 32, and 43.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8617) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 30, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. COOLIDGE, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPUBLICAN REACTION

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIEL A. REED].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, by permission granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD the following address delivered by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, on Wednesday evening, April 18, over a national network:

Friends of the radio audience, this Nation has been and is still passing through a most trying time. This, however, is not the first crisis this country has had to face. Let us go back three quarters of a century. In May 1860 the National Convention of the Republican Party was in session at Chicago. Ten thousand people were packed in the historic old building known as the Wigwam. A platform was adopted. The paramount issue in that party platform was the preservation of the Union.

The third day of the convention came. Delegates were in their seats. Interest was at white heat. The first and second ballots had been taken. Lincoln was steadily gaining over Seward. When the third ballot was cast, the result was not announced. Not a sound could be heard except the scratching of pencils as the delegates added up the vote. But it was known Abraham

Lincoln lacked only one and a half votes to place him in nomination for the Presidency.

Suddenly, from the great crowd a shrill voice that penetrated every corner of the Old Wigwam, announced, "Ohio changes four votes to Abraham Lincoln!" It was like an electric spark applied to a high explosive. Hats, coats, canes, umbrellas, and shawls were tossed into the air. Strong men embraced each other and wept. The band struck up, and the great crowd marched and yelled to the point of exhaustion.

When the excitement had subsided, a distinguished man walked up to the platform. It was William M. Everts, chairman of the New York delegation. He said "Mr. Chairman, we came from a great State with a great candidate whom we had hoped to see nominated. In the name of that great State, and at the request of that great candidate, I move that the nomination of Abraham Lincoln be made unanimous." There followed another wild demonstration. Before the enthusiasm had subsided, some man in the gallery shouted, "Three cheers for Honest Old Abe!" That was the slogan of the stirring campaign that followed.

Persons everywhere and in all walks of life who believed in constitutional government rallied to the support of Abraham Lincoln. They knew they could trust him. They knew that when he made a promise, he would keep it. Because of the faith of the people in constitutional government and their firm belief in the integrity of Lincoln, he was elected President.

How different the scene when as President-elect he entered the Capital City, from modern demonstrations when the President returned from a short vacation. There was no military band, no crowds. Abraham Lincoln stepped off the train early in the morning. He was alone. Two men, and only two men, were there to greet him.

The task with which President Lincoln was confronted was to examine into the state of the Union. First he turned to the Army. There was no Army. It had been marched into Texas and to the Mexican border. The officers had been ordered to deliver the United States Army over to the States.

Next Mr. Lincoln turned to the Navy. All seaworthy ships except four had been ordered from northern waters to southern seas.

Then Mr. Lincoln inquired into the condition of the United States Treasury. It was empty. The credit of the United States had been destroyed.

These were the conditions that confronted Abraham Lincoln at a time when hostile forces were almost within sight of the Capitol. He had to organize an army. He had to rebuild the Navy. Abraham Lincoln organized an army. He built an invincible navy. He reestablished the credit of the United States. It cost the Nation the lives of 600,000 men and the sum of \$10,000,000,000 to save the Union.

Lincoln required no "brain trust" to meet the crisis. A "brain trust" was proposed, and he scorned it. All the support he asked was the confidence of the people, and he received it in fullest measure. Why did the people follow the leadership of Abraham Lincoln throughout the great crisis? It was because he never made a promise he did not keep. The people knew they could trust him.

The same political party that left its heritage of debt and disaster in 1860 is the same political party in power today. Twenty years ago the Democratic Party asked the suffrage of the people "to keep us out of war." The people accepted that promise at its face value and placed the party in power. It was known by the Democratic Party when the "promise to keep us out of war" was made that the pledge could not be kept. When we entered the World War, our national debt was less than \$2,000,000,000. In less than 2 years our Nation emerged from the war with an indebtedness of \$26,000,000,000. Industries were closed. Six million men were idle.

Again the people turned to the Republican Party to rehabilitate the country. Within 1 year the unemployed were put back to work. Year by year for 10 years the national debt was being reduced about \$1,000,000,000 a year. Taxes were reduced five times in this period.

Finally, a great tidal wave of financial disorder and social unrest, the backwash of the World War, swept across the nations of the earth, hurling them one by one upon the hidden reefs of communism and state socialism. Dictators became the last resort. That our Nation felt the impact of this backwash, that our people suffered no person can gainsay, but it cannot be successfully denied that our people suffered less from the great world disaster than did the people of other nations.

It is in the hour of distress that many people turn to political nostrums for relief. Such a time of acute suffering is a paradise for visionary theorists and demagogues. Promises are their stock in trade. No political party in this country ever made a more alluring set of promises to a distressed people to obtain their suffrage than did the Democratic Party in its party platform adopted at Chicago in 1932. The platform was expressed in the most convincing language. The platform had this to say:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

The candidate, Mr. Roosevelt, who had become the idol of millions of people, inspired absolute confidence in the platform pledges when he declared: "The platform which you have adopted is clear. I accept it 100 percent."

President Roosevelt, by common consent, became the leader not alone of his party but of the whole Nation. Party lines disap-

peared. A hundred million people responded to the call for concerted action to carry out every pledge in the Democratic platform and every promise made by its Presidential candidate.

What was one of the first promises made in the Democratic platform? It was this:

"We advocate an immediate, drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices."

Has this promise been kept? It has not. Instead, a bureaucracy has been set up that rivals in size of personnel and in magnitude of expenditures any other bureaucratic government in the world. The alphabet is incapable of enough combinations of letters to designate the new commissions.

The Democratic Party, in its platform, said: "We advocate a sound currency to be maintained at all hazards."

The American dollar has been reduced to 59 cents. This reduced the debt owed to the United States by foreign countries 40 percent.

Why are the people bewildered? On April 24, 1933, Secretary Woodin offered for sale United States Treasury 3-year notes or bonds in the amount of \$500,000,000, bearing 2½-percent interest. They were issued in small denominations of \$100 each to enable the man or woman of average means to invest. Secretary Woodin issued an official statement to encourage the people to buy these bonds. Here is what he promised: "The principal and interest of the notes will be payable in United States gold coin of the present standard of value."

Why are the people bewildered? Let us see what happened to these bonds. Four weeks after Secretary Woodin issued the statement, Congress passed a resolution repudiating this promise. It repudiated the gold clause contained in every United States bond. The President signed this resolution. This is the first time in our history that the United States Government has repudiated its obligations.

An eminent psychologist has said, "He who makes himself the master of opinion may lead a people to perform the most heroic actions as well as enter upon the most absurd adventures." The cost to the taxpayer has received little consideration. The expenditure of billions of dollars to carry out the socialistic program that has been adopted must eventually be paid. This debt burden of the Government has already reached staggering proportions. Every day the credit of the Government is being driven nearer to the brink of printing-press inflation. The day of reckoning cannot long be deferred. The tax bill now pending in Congress does not reveal to the taxpayers the ultimate cost which they will have to bear for the present mismanagement of the financial administration of the Nation.

The cost of the "brain trust" experiments must not be measured alone in money. Loss of individual freedom may prove far more disastrous to the American citizen than the loss of property. A program of planned economy means that a man's least actions shall be directed by the State; the individual is to possess no initiative; all acts of his life are mapped out. Under this system the farmer is to be told where he shall live, what he shall produce and how much, when he shall sell, to whom he shall sell, and the price he shall receive for what he produces. Failure to obey the edicts of a bureaucrat sent out from Washington may hale him into court for any violation of the rules and regulations promulgated by a bureaucrat under such a program. It must be recognized that no man in government is infallible. This has been demonstrated in the cancellation of the air-mail contracts. This official blunder resulting in almost complete paralysis of commercial aviation in the United States and in the death of 10 young men ought to be sufficient warning of the danger of vesting too much power in one man. Even when Col. Charles Lindbergh sought to advise of the danger, he was charged with seeking publicity.

Under a planned-economy program directed by fallible governmental functionaries individual liberty can be destroyed by an error in bureaucratic judgment, and from this mistake there is no appeal. Planned economy goes further than this, if carried to its ultimate conclusion. It means confiscation by the Government of capital, mines, and property, and the administration and redistribution of the public wealth by an immense army of bureaucrats. The Government, under the plan, would manufacture everything and permit no competition. The least signs of initiative, individual liberty, or competition would be suppressed.

To what extent has the Government attempted such a program, so far as industry is concerned? The Democratic platform contains this pledge:

"The removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and national resources in the common interest." Regardless of this pledge, there was transferred to the Postmaster General from the Public Works fund \$525,000 for the erection of a Government factory at Reidsville, W.Va. This attempted abuse of power and direct attempt to enter into competition with private business in the manufacture of furniture was defeated in the House by a vote of 275 to 110.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is another example of a definite move toward state socialism. Under this act, a corporation has been formed. Its charter contains these broad powers:

"To produce, raise, manufacture, buy, sell, deal in, and to engage in, conduct, and carry on the business of producing, manufacturing, buying, selling, and dealing in farm products, livestock, goods, wares, and merchandise of every class and description necessary or useful for the operation of the corporation."

It has the power under its charter to lend or advance money, to endorse the notes, and to guarantee the obligations of indi-

viduals, firms, corporations, or others with or without collateral security whatsoever.

This is only one of several corporations organized by the Federal Government under the Tennessee Valley Authority empowered to enter into competition with private farms and private factories.

Let me again repeat that the colossal national debt must eventually be paid by the American taxpayer. When the day of final reckoning comes, the task of the taxpayer will be like that of Sisyphus, who was condemned by the gods continually to roll a rock to the summit of a high mountain, whence it invariably rolled back again.

I do not believe American citizens will submit to a program that tends to reduce every individual to a common type and to place them under the guardianship of a strongly centralized government. Bertrand Russell, the mathematician, describes such an average type as a person "without passion or vices, neither mad nor wise, with average ideas, average opinions, he will die at an average age, of an average malady invented by the statisticians."

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 349

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House met on the forenoon of April 21, 1934, and took up for consideration the bill H.R. 7908, which was not read; and

Whereas thereupon a motion was made in said committee to strike out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 7908 and substitute therefor the text of H.R. 9175, commonly known as the "Brown bill", and that the said H.R. 7908, as thus amended, be reported favorably to the House; and

Whereas the said Banking and Currency Committee thereupon adopted the aforesaid motion and proposes to report said H.R. 7908, as amended, to the House; and

Whereas the said H.R. 7908, which the said Banking and Currency Committee voted to report to the House, was at no time read in committee for amendment by section or by paragraph, either by the chairman or the clerk of said committee, as required by section 26, paragraph 412 of Jefferson's Manual; and

Whereas House rule no. 43 provides that "The rules of parliamentary practice in Jefferson's Manual shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable * * *"; and

Whereas House rule no. 12 provides that "The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable * * *"; and

Whereas section 26, paragraph 412 of Jefferson's Manual, among other things, provides that in the case of "a bill, resolutions, draft of an address", etc., originating with or referred to a committee, "in every case the whole paper is read first by the clerk and then by the chairman, by paragraphs, pausing at the end of each paragraph, and putting questions for amending, if proposed"; and

Whereas the said failure of the said Banking and Currency Committee to comply with the rule as stated in section 26, paragraph 412, vitiates the committee's attempt properly to report out H.R. 7908, and vitally affects the regularity and integrity of the proceedings of the House itself; and

Whereas the right of said Banking and Currency Committee to report said H.R. 7908 to the House, for the reasons herein set forth, raises a doubt as to the regularity and validity of the proceedings of said committee and its attempt to make a report on H.R. 7908; and

Whereas the reception of said report by the House is objected to and disputed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the question whether the House shall receive said report be submitted to the House forthwith.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the resolution that it does not set out a question of the privilege of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that it is an attempt to impeach the integrity of the action of a committee when every rule of the House is presumed to have been adhered to in the committee and followed, unless the records and the minutes of the committee itself show to the contrary and show that points of order were made in the committee that the rules were not being followed. There is no attempt here in this resolution to set out any statement to the effect that points of order were made in the committee that the rules were not being followed, and in the absence of such points of order, as shown by the minutes of the record, the presumption is and it always has been the presumption, that the rules have been followed in the committee.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the point of order has already been made that this is not a privileged resolution; and since

that has been made, I shall not remake it, although I rose for that purpose. It is very clear, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has said, that this is an effort to impeach the action of a standing committee of this House by a recitation of facts which are not supported by any record of the committee or any statements which have been filed with the resolution. It seems to me that if it is possible for a Member of this House, whether he be a member of the committee or not, whenever a bill is reported, to rise in his seat and offer a resolution of this kind, it would be possible to disturb the whole committee organization of the House and would not guarantee that the action of any committee, whether it be the Banking and Currency Committee or any other committee, is to be given any force and effect.

I take it there is no precedent for a resolution of this kind. It is sprung here suddenly. No one had any intimation, at least on this side of the Chamber, that such a resolution would be proposed, and, I repeat, this effort to impeach the action of a standing committee which was taken in regular session of that committee, and by a majority vote, is not in order, and especially when the gentleman admits that he sat still and makes no question of the action taken at the time. I am surprised that the gentleman should have so deliberately taken advantage of his colleagues on the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken in stating that there is no precedent. There is a precedent, and I am sure the Parliamentarian can cite it to the Speaker, where Mr. Speaker Gillett held that in the House you could not attack the integrity of the proceedings of a committee by a mere resolution unless you show by the minutes of the committee that points of order were made in the committee and overruled and that the rules were not adhered to; that the presumption is that the rules were adhered to in committee, and you cannot attack it by such a resolution.

Mr. BYRNS. There may be such a precedent. I am sure if there is a precedent, it sustains the position taken by the gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman from Texas, and myself, because I cannot imagine a situation where the integrity of a standing committee can be attacked upon the floor of the House in this manner.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the only question raised by the offering of this resolution is whether or not it sets out a proceeding which violates the integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives. In other words, to sustain the position of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY], the resolution must set out on its face a question that goes directly to the integrity of the proceedings of the House. Such a question was raised on the floor of the House some years ago in a resolution which I presented with reference to the meetings of the Veterans' Committee. We went into the question thoroughly at that time.

For a resolution of this kind to be in order it must set out on its face a violation of the integrity of the proceedings of the House, or a question that goes directly and vitally to the integrity of such proceedings; and that, I submit, this resolution does not do. The resolution recites what took place in the committee and alleges violation of the rules that could have been taken advantage of in the committee. Now, if these proceedings were not regular the place to have raised the question, as laid down in Jefferson's Manual, was in the committee.

The rule referred to in the resolution does not mean that every section of every bill must be read in committee, but it does mean that the members of the committee have a right to raise that question in the committee and are entitled to be protected by the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that to uphold the contention laid down in this resolution, and to hold this motion in order, would be to establish a precedent which could be invoked to question practically every bill brought to the floor of the House.

The gentleman in his resolution has not raised a question that goes to the integrity of the proceedings of the House; and the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, rule no. IX reads in part:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings. * * *

I emphasize the words "the House collectively", because I believe the pending resolution does not properly raise a question of the privileges of the House itself.

If in a meeting of one of the committees of the House anything is done in violation of the rules of the House, the first place to protest or insist on compliance with the rules is in the committee itself; then if the procedure complained of is not in compliance with the rules, then the matter may be brought before the House on a point of order against the report of the committee, or the consideration of the bill or resolution reported.

I contend that the proper way to correct any action taken in the committee contrary to the rules is by way of a point of order against the consideration of that matter coming before the House, and that by no stretch of the language of this rule IX do the proceedings in the committee affect the rights of the House collectively so as to make the point "a privilege of the House."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, two issues are involved. The first one, to which I shall address myself briefly, is whether the resolution raises a question involving the privileges of the House.

As the rule states, anything affecting the integrity of the proceedings of the House raises a question of privilege. The word "integrity" means "soundness." That is the best synonym for it I can find in the dictionary. The question, then, is, Were the proceedings of this committee sound; did they conform to the rules of the House? And here, lest I forget it later, let me state what I believe we will all concede, namely, the fundamental proposition that there is never a moment when the House loses control over the conduct of its committees, which are a branch of the House.

There is a rule governing procedure involving amendments in committee, and it will not be contended that the rule was followed. It is contended that the one and only opportunity for the House to protect itself is through the acts of Members who happen to be in the particular committee at the moment. What a spurious doctrine that would be for the House to stand on! If that were to be the rule of conduct, then any recalcitrant Member who was not in sympathy with the legislation might sit idly in committee and by refusing to make an objection to any irregularity forfeit forever the rights of the House to have its committees function with regularity and under the rules. That cannot be so. But, so far as that goes, I objected to the whole proceedings in committee.

I made it very clear that I would have nothing to do with them because I did not think that the reporting of the bill in question by the committee was a move to procure legislation but was, rather, an attempt to interfere with the rights acquired by a minority of 145 Members of this House when the required number of signatures were secured and the petition completed. Therefore, I refused to have anything to do with the proceedings and voted "present." That is the broadest objection to everything that took place in the committee that I knew how to make.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Was there a member of the committee who raised the question at the time that the bill ought to be read, as the gentleman claims in the resolution?

Mr. BEEDY. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that if I had raised that point I should have said so. Instead I made a broader objection. I objected to the whole proceedings of the committee. I did not make any specific objections.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman in his resolution does not say that any member of the committee raised the question of whether the bill should be read.

The gentleman knows that in this House, unless request is made to the contrary, many bills are passed by unanimous consent. That is done on the floor of this House frequently; and if the gentleman, as a member of the committee, sat there and did not raise his voice in protest, he has waived his rights.

Mr. BEEDY. I did not; and I contend that I could not waive any rights of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BEEDY. Not at this time. I contend it was not the duty of any Member to raise specific objections, and that this House could not be foreclosed upon its right to insist, as I shall show presently by decisions, that its committees conform to the rules.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a question only.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman knows that appropriation bills, bills involving hundreds of millions of dollars, are read scientifically from that desk frequently, with half pages skipped here and there. Does not the gentleman know he cannot raise a point of order to that procedure afterward unless the point of order is raised at the time of the reading? The presumption is that the bills are read according to the rules.

Mr. BEEDY. Whether that can be done or not, I submit, would be irrelevant to the issue here involved.

The rules in committee are analogous to the rules of the House. No bill which was not read for amendment in the House would be considered legally passed, and the same is true in a committee. But the question is asked, Was this point of reading the bill for amendment raised there? No; it was not. And I submit that the failure to raise it cannot forfeit the rights of the House to control the action of its committees in this or any other respect.

If the gentlemen will bear with me I will cite a decision which I think will disabuse anyone's mind of any doubt.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman is a lawyer?

Mr. BEEDY. I used to be.

Mr. BYRNS. I am sure the gentleman was a good lawyer. May I ask the gentleman what he thinks a Supreme Court would do on a general objection such as the gentleman just stated he made in committee? In other words, the gentleman voted present.

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman made no specific objection. What would a Supreme Court do under these circumstances if that sort of procedure were followed in an inferior court of law?

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman from Tennessee desires an answer, it seems to me that if the Supreme Court exercised good judgment and sound sense, as I think it would, the Supreme Court would say that my conduct was absolutely consistent, that by having objected to the proceedings and refusing to become a party to the proceedings by a vote either in the affirmative or negative, I very properly voted "present."

Mr. WEIDEMAN. If they were acting in equity, there would not be any doubt but what they would listen to the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman state upon what specific grounds he is offering the resolution?

Mr. BEEDY. The grounds are stated in the resolution. I refuse to yield further; I desire to go on with my statement.

Whether there is a question of privilege involved in this resolution or not, I submit to the Speaker that, in any event, a Member of the House may at any time rise in his place; and if he objects to the receipt of a report of a committee by this House, the Speaker must put the question to the House, whether the House will receive the committee report or not.

I call the attention of the Speaker to a rule in the manual, which is to be found at the top of page 222, section 39, of the manual. The manual is here dealing with

the putting of a question, whatever the question may be. The section is as follows:

But in small matters, and which are, of course, such as receiving petitions, reports, motions, etc., the Speaker most commonly supposes the consent of the House where no objection is expressed and does not give them the trouble of putting the question formally.

If the Speaker will bear with me further, I will make myself a little clearer. It is very apparent from the reading of this section that for the convenience of the House the Speaker does not ask the House if it will receive a report every time one is offered. Yet, bear in mind that the House at all times is in full control of the actions of its committees. That is an inherent right of this House.

In small matters even the Speaker makes the same assumption if there is no objection, viz, that the House will receive the report, no objection being offered. The plain inference is that if there is objection raised the Speaker then must put to the House the question, Will the House receive the report of the committee?

I refer the Speaker to two decisions, one to be found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, page 938, section 4591. This decision was made by the eminent Speaker, Charles F. Crisp. On the 1st of February 1895, a Representative from Illinois, then a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, attempted to submit a privileged report to the House. One of the Members raised an objection to it, stating that it did not present fully or accurately the views of the committee. The Member claimed it was irregular in this respect. The Speaker stated this, and mark these words, Mr. Speaker:

If objection were made, the question would be, Shall the report be received by the House?

The mere raising of an objection brings up that inherent right of the House to control the conduct of its committees, and the Speaker at that time stated that the question immediately arises, Shall the report be received by the House?

Permit me to make another point clearer here. I refer again to Hinds' Precedents, the same volume, page 937, section 4588. In this case there was an attempt by a Committee on Public Lands to bring in a report on a bill. It was contended that there were irregularities in the proceedings of the committee in passing upon the bill. There was a statement as to just what those irregularities were. A request was made that the question be submitted to the House whether the House would receive the report of the committee. Speaker John White, of Kentucky, stated:

No question of order is involved. The question is, Shall the bill be received as the report of the committee? That is for the House alone to decide, and if the reception of the bill was objected to, that question would be put to the House.

Mr. Speaker, thereupon Mr. Cox, who was making the objection, said, "I withdraw the objection." I do not withdraw my objection. I make the objection that this report of the committee is not regularly made. It is born of an infringement of the rules of this House.

It is not necessary, however, that the Speaker now decide whether there were irregularities in committee, as I view it. If a question of privilege is raised by my resolution, then it is in order to be passed on by the House.

The Speaker must put the question to the House, Shall the House receive this report of the committee? And I ask, on my objection to this report, that the Speaker put to the House the question, Shall the House receive the report of the committee on H.R. 7908?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I am pleased now to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. The gentleman will recall that I was present in committee when this matter was under consideration. At that time, when the vote was being taken on reporting out this measure, the gentleman will recall that when the Clerk called his name he voted "no." The gentleman will also recall that when the Clerk said to him, "How did you vote?" the gentleman said, "Well, I had

better vote "present", and the gentleman withdrew his vote of "no."

Mr. BEEDY. Oh, no.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I recall that, sir.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman does not recollect correctly what transpired.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I recollect that.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman is incorrect. I did not vote "no." I had no hesitation whatever as to my vote. I announced in advance to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER], who sat near me, that I was about to vote "present", and he it was who said, "I thought I might vote 'no'", or words to such effect, "because I am, in fact, opposed to this legislation, but I shall vote 'present.'" I take it the gentleman from Ohio did not wish to soil his hands with the procedure then being followed by the committee.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Oh, no.

Mr. BEEDY. The action of the committee was not to secure legislation but to defeat the will of the Membership of the House as expressed in a petition to inaugurate the discharge rule.

Mr. WEIDEMAN and Mr. KOPPLEMANN rose.

Mr. BEEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEIDEMAN].

Mr. WEIDEMAN. In other words, there is not any doubt that when this matter was considered before the gentleman's committee the Members who were most active in getting the McLeod bill before the House and the members of the Banking Committee were willing to accept most of the Brown bill as an amendment to the McLeod bill, and when the committee voted on that they knew the only way they could obstruct this legislation from coming before this House was by passing out some bill and amending the McLeod bill, and this was the only way it could be obstructed, was it not?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes; but in my opinion the committee does not desire any action on that bill either.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield? I had not concluded my questions.

Mr. BEEDY. I do not care to yield any further.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. STEAGALL. Was the gentleman from Maine present at all the meetings of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the McLeod bill was under consideration?

Mr. BEEDY. Prior to Saturday's meeting I was not present for the reason, as the chairman knows—

Mr. STEAGALL. Then I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact—

Mr. BEEDY. For the reason, I was about to state, that I received notice of the meeting from the chairman, and as the chairman knows, the meeting was irregularly held, and the gentleman himself had to come into the House and try to remedy the error made in holding the meeting. I did not participate in it and I am pleased to say that I was not present. I had no part in those irregular proceedings, nor do I acquiesce in the irregularity of the proceedings of Saturday. I stand on my rights as a Member of this House fighting for the rights of the House to control at all times the action of its committees. [Applause.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. STEAGALL. Does the gentleman understand that at a prior session of the committee the McLeod bill and the amendment adopted to the McLeod bill and reported were read in full and considered by the committee?

Mr. BEEDY. I have no such understanding; in fact, the bill was not even introduced until after that meeting was held.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman his failure to understand it grows out of the fact that he was not present. It is a fact that at a former meeting of the committee the McLeod bill was read, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Brown] was read, amended, and adopted and ordered reported as a substitute for the McLeod bill, and the meeting on Saturday was simply called

for the purpose of filing a subsequent report on the measures read and considered at a former meeting, as every member of the committee who was present will testify.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I think these facts should be cleared up for the benefit of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that the committee met and adopted what was presumed to be at that time the Brown bill on the 12th of the month. The bill which was substituted for H.R. 7908 on Saturday last was not introduced in this House until April 17, and that bill has never been read in committee, and the bill H.R. 7908 was not read in the committee when the substitute was adopted.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman in that connection, if he will permit—

Mr. BEEDY. I do not care to yield further.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will not the gentleman yield to me?

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. BEEDY. This is the regular order. I desire to conclude my remarks. The bill which was adopted on Saturday, the subject matter of the so-called "Brown bill", was never read before the committee for amendment, and this is the irregularity which I do not waive.

Mr. SISSON. How do you know—you were not there?

Mr. BEEDY. I stand on my right to object to and to question the legality of the report filed by this committee, and I ask that the question be submitted to the House, whether the House will receive the report of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, a question has been raised which reflects upon the accuracy of one of my statements. The gentleman from Alabama, I believe it was, who cried out, without addressing the Speaker, and generally he is very much of a gentleman and obeys the rules of this House—if I am wrong the gentleman will correct me—I thought I recognized his voice, yet I thought it was quite unlike the gentleman. But somebody behind me said, "How do you know"—possibly it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson] who said, "How do you know, you were not there at the meeting." My answer is that I know, because the bill in question, which was substituted on Saturday last, was not introduced until the 17th of this month. Therefore it could not have been read for amendment prior thereto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was the gentleman alluding to me as the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BEEDY. I was. I alluded to the gentleman who I have found to be always decorous and always the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the gentleman, but the assumption that I made the remark is entirely in his imagination, for I made no such statement during the course of the debate.

Mr. BEEDY. I accept the gentleman's statement. It was the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sisson], I understand, who made the remark without addressing the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see how the gentleman could pick me out. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEEDY. I thought I recognized the gentleman's voice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. It is contended by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY] that the resolution he has presented, of which he is the author, presents a question of privilege affecting the rights of the House and the integrity of its proceedings.

When Mr. Reed, of Maine, was Speaker of the House in 1891 a matter very much like this was presented to him. At that time there was no rule of the House prescribing a method of discharging a committee from the consideration of a bill.

A report had been ordered to be made by a committee. It was not made within a reasonable time, and a resolution

directing the report to be made was decided by Speaker Reed to present a question of the privilege of the House.

Questions of privilege are, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

The ruling of Speaker Reed to which I have alluded can be found in volume 3, Hinds' Precedents, page 1085.

The Chair holds that the resolution presents a question of privilege, and it is for the House to adopt or reject the resolution. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. GOSS. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. If I vote "aye", does that mean—

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order. We are discussing whether we will have a roll call.

Mr. RICH. Before I vote on this I should like to know—

Mr. BYRNS (interrupting). The gentleman is an intelligent Member of this House, and he ought to know the rules. The question was taken, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan cannot interrupt a roll call.

Mr. McLEOD. The roll call has not yet begun. I should like to ask the Speaker what is the significance of an "aye" vote and the significance of a "no" vote?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 123, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—227

Abernethy	Delaney	Larrabee	Robinson
Adams	DeRouen	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, N.H.
Andrew, Mass.	Dickinson	Lee, Mo.	Romjue
Andrews, N.Y.	Disney	Lehr	Ruffin
Arnold	Dobbins	Lewis, Colo.	Sabath
Auf der Heide	Dockweiler	Lloyd	Sanders
Ayers, Mont.	Doughton	Lozier	Sandlin
Ayres, Kans.	Doxey	Luce	Scruggam
Bankhead	Driver	Ludlow	Sears
Berlin	Duncan, Mo.	McClinton	Secrest
Biermann	Eagle	McDuffie	Shallenberger
Black	Edmiston	McFarlane	Sisson
Bland	Ellzey, Miss.	McGugin	Smith, Va.
Blanton	Faddis	McKeown	Smith, W.Va.
Boehne	Farley	McMillan	Snell
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	McReynolds	Snyder
Brown, Ky.	Fitzpatrick	Maloney, La.	Somers, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Flannagan	Mansfield	Spence
Buchanan	Fletcher	Mapes	Steagall
Buck	Ford	Marland	Strong, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Foulkes	Martin, Colo.	Stubbs
Burch	Fuller	Martin, Mass.	Summers, Tex.
Burke, Nebr.	Fulmer	Martin, Oreg.	Swank
Busby	Gambrill	May	Tarver
Byrns	Gavagan	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Caldwell	Gillette	Meeks	Taylor, S.C.
Cannon, Mo.	Glover	Merritt	Terrell, Tex.
Carden, Ky.	Goldsbrough	Millard	Terry, Ark.
Carmichael	Granfield	Miller	Thom
Carpenter, Kans.	Gray	Milligan	Thomason
Cartwright	Greenway	Mitchell	Thompson, Ill.
Cary	Gregory	Montague	Thompson, Tex.
Castellow	Griswold	Montet	Tinkham
Chapman	Hancock, N.C.	Moran	Treadway
Christianson	Harter	Morehead	Turner
Claborn	Hastings	Murdock	Umstead
Clark, N.C.	Henney	Norton	Underwood
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Connor	Vinson, Ga.
Coffin	Hoidale	Oliver, N.Y.	Wallgren
Colden	Hollister	Owen	Walter
Cole	Hope	Parker	Warren
Colmer	Huddleston	Parks	Wearin
Condon	Hughes	Parsons	Weaver
Connery	Jacobsen	Patman	Werner
Cooper, Tenn.	Johnson, Tex.	Pettengill	West, Ohio
Cox	Johnson, W.Va.	Peyser	West, Tex.
Cravens	Jones	Pierce	White
Cross, Tex.	Kee	Polk	Whittington
Crosser, Ohio	Keller	Prall	Wilcox
Crowe	Kerr	Ramspeck	Willford
Crump	Kieberg	Randolph	Williams
Culkin	Kloeb	Rankin	Wilson
Cullen	Kocialkowski	Rayburn	Wood, Ga.
Cummings	Kopplemann	Reilly	Wood, Mo.
Darden	Kramer	Richards	Woodrum
Dear	Lambeth	Richardson	Zioncheck
Deen	Lamneck	Robertson	

NAYS—123

Adair	Duffey	Kinzer	Sadowski
Allen	Dunn	Kniffin	Schuetz
Arens	Durgan, Ind.	Knutson	Schulte
Bacharach	Ellenbogen	Kurtz	Seger
Bakewell	Eltse, Calif.	Kvale	Shannon
Beam	Englebright	Lambertson	Simpson
Beedy	Evans	Lehlbach	Sinclair
Blanchard	Flesinger	Lemke	Smith, Wash.
Bolleau	Fish	Lesinski	Stalker
Britten	Foss	Lundeen	Strong, Pa.
Brumm	Frear	McCormack	Studley
Brunner	Gifford	McFadden	Sweeney
Burke, Calif.	Gilchrist	McGrath	Taber
Burnham	Goodwin	McLean	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter, Calif.	Goss	McLeod	Thomas
Cavicchia	Guyer	Marshall	Tobey
Chase	Hancock, N.Y.	Mott	Traeger
Clarke, N.Y.	Hart	Moynihan, Ill.	Truax
Cochran, Pa.	Healey	Muldowney	Utterback
Collins, Calif.	Higgins	Musselwhite	Wadsworth
Connolly	Hildebrandt	O'Brien	Weideman
Cooper, Ohio	Hoeppel	O'Malley	Welch
Crowther	Holmes	Peavey	Whitley
Darrow	Imhoff	Perkins	Wigglesworth
De Priest	James	Powers	Withrow
Dingell	Johnson, Minn.	Ransley	Wolcott
Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	Reece	Wolfenden
Ditter	Kahn	Reed, N.Y.	Wolverton
Dondero	Kelly, Ill.	Rich	Woodruff
Douglass	Kelly, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.	Young
Dowell	Kenney	Rudd	

NOT VOTING—80

Allgood	Church	Hamilton	Nesbit
Bacon	Collins, Miss.	Harlan	O'Connell
Bailey	Corning	Hartley	Oliver, Ala.
Beck	Crosby	Hess	Palmisano
Better	Dickstein	Hill, Ala.	Peterson
Bloom	Dies	Hill, Knute	Plumley
Boland	Doutrich	Howard	Ramsay
Bolton	Drewry	Jeffers	Reld, Ill.
Boylan	Eaton	Jenckes, Ind.	Rogers, Okla.
Brennan	Edmonds	Jenkins, Ohio	Schaefer
Brooks	Eicher	Kennedy, Md.	Shoemaker
Browning	Fitzgibbons	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sirovich
Buckbee	Focht	Lanham	Stokes
Cady	Frey	Lanzetta	Sullivan
Cannon, Wis.	Gasque	Lewis, Md.	Sutphin
Carley, N.Y.	Gillespie	Lindsay	Swick
Carpenter, Nebr.	Green	McCarthy	Thurston
Carter, Wyo.	Greenwood	McSwain	Turpin
Celler	Griffin	Maloney, Conn.	Vinson, Ky.
Chavez	Haines	Monaghan, Mont.	Waldron

So the motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEY, Mr. BRITTEN, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. BEAM, and Mr. KELLY of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boylan (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).
 Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).
 Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana (for) with Mr. Stokes (against).
 Mrs. McCarthy (for) with Mr. Buckbee (against).
 Mr. Harlan (for) with Mr. Carter of Wyoming (against).
 Mr. Lanham (for) with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio (against).
 Mr. Hamilton (for) with Mr. Turpin (against).
 Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Bolton (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Bacon.
 Mr. Collins of Mississippi with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Oliver of Alabama with Mr. Beck.
 Mr. Maloney of Connecticut with Mr. Swick.
 Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Edmunds.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Hill of Alabama with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Reld of Illinois.
 Mr. Vinson of Kentucky with Mr. Waldron.
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Shoemaker.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Crosby.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Carpenter of Nebraska.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Peterson.
 Mr. Lanzetta with Mr. Schaefer.
 Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Cady.
 Mr. Allgood with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Browning with Mr. Belter.
 Mr. Haines with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland.
 Mr. Chavez with Mr. Ramsay.
 Mr. Jeffers with Mr. Monaghan of Montana.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Gillespie.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Knute Hill.
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. O'Connell.
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Eicher.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Carley of New York.
 Mr. Fitzgibbons with Mr. Church.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was laid on the table was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution for printing under the rules:

House Resolution 350 (Rept. No. 1297)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 752, an act to amend section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States over suits relating to orders of State administrative boards; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

THE WIRT COMMITTEE

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, recently there was created by resolution of the House a select committee to investigate certain charges made by Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind. The committee held certain hearings and has concluded its activities.

The charges of Dr. William A. Wirt, which form the basis of this inquiry, may be summarized as follows:

Certain persons in positions of influence and authority in the administration hold these beliefs:

The depression demonstrates that the political, economical, and social organization of our country, heretofore accepted as the embodiment of American traditions and ideals, is inadequate to insure the temporal well-being and security of the people. The concept that American men and women constitute a free people must be scrapped.

In its stead must be erected a planned economy wherein the everyday activities of American citizens in agriculture, industry, transportation, merchandizing, and other pursuits, including labor, are controlled and regimented by the Government functioning through numerous bureaus. It necessarily follows that remuneration for such activities and the wealth invested therein likewise are in the control of the Government, even if the naked title to such properties are left in the present owners.

Inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States is the keystone of the arch supporting the concept of a free people, its provisions must be disregarded and allowed to fall into desuetude.

Dr. Wirt further charges that these persons holding the opinions above set forth are using their positions in the administration to draft measures, ostensibly temporary in character and purported to accelerate present recovery, which, in effect, operate to further the regimented economy plan. Such measures necessarily retard immediate economic improvement, which is all right with the economic planners, because the more serious the plight of the people the more readily will they submit to the proposed new order.

No suggestion was advanced that any such persons contemplate physical violence, or that the established agencies of the Government be forcibly overthrown.

This, in substance, is the contention of Dr. Wirt, the truth of which this committee was created to probe. The committee limited its activities to an attempt to ascertain the sources of information upon which Dr. Wirt based his statement.

This was an utterly futile proceeding. Every well-informed person knows from the speeches, published writings, and radio addresses by Government officials constituting what is commonly known as the "brain trust" that their

political, economic, and social philosophy is substantially as set forth by Dr. Wirt.

Activities in furtherance of the establishment of a socialized economy seem apparent to an increasing number of our people. They view with misgiving a securities act purported to protect investors from cheaters, drying up sources of much-needed credit for industry struggling toward recovery; a proposed law to regulate stock and commodity exchanges, ostensibly to check insensate speculation, threatening to convert a business investment into a frozen asset by the destruction of its market; the absorption of available credit resources of our banking system by dumping upon it huge Government issues. The inability or unwillingness of the Government to stabilize our currency renders it prohibitive for business to engage in long-term commitments of international character. These are but a few instances that have engendered doubt and dismay.

This committee is not authorized to sit in judgment upon the relative merits of the old order of a free people or a Government-regulated mode of American life. Under a broad, common-sense construction of the resolution creating the committee, we were commissioned to investigate whether Government officials believing in a socialized American order were so functioning as to facilitate its establishment. In short, What are the purposes of the "brain trust" and what are they doing about it?

This the American people are entitled to know. This it was not only the privilege but the duty of the committee to ascertain.

Unfortunately, the committee booted away its opportunity. [Applause.]

PAYMENTS OF ASSETS IN CLOSED BANKS

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7908, which is on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order and does not lie, because of the fact that the committee has reported the bill, and, therefore, cannot be discharged from its consideration.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for an inquiry?

Mr. STEAGALL. I cannot withhold the point of order.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order and yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman, as Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, advise the House if it is the intention of that committee to call up that bill this week, which the committee has reported out?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, that is immaterial.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Michigan is out of order, and I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. The point of order should be acted upon.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman's question does not in any way involve the matter before the House.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] reserved the point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, no.

Mr. BEEDY. And yielded to the gentleman from Michigan for a question. That was the specific request that the gentleman from Michigan made, and the question is not out of order.

Mr. McLEOD. The gentleman attempted to answer the question when he was cut off.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if a bill is improperly reported to the House—and I believe in this particular instance the Chair has already ruled,

that where a committee sits during the sessions of the House without receiving permission of the House—the action of the committee in reporting out this bill is a nullity. It is void ab initio; that is, from the very beginning and for all intents and purposes the bill has never left the committee. In the case of other irregularities, not perhaps of a like nature but of equal importance, whereby members of the committee were shut off in the exercise of their rights, under the rules of the House and the committee, to offer amendments to perfect the bill, then that is of equal importance and effect and that bill as reported out and the report is equally void.

I call the Chair's attention to the rule, with which he is familiar, section 412 of Jefferson's Manual, which reads in part as follows:

In every case the whole paper is read first by the Clerk and then by the chairman by paragraphs pausing at the end of each paragraph and putting questions for amendment, if proposed.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that if that were not done—and I want to say on my own responsibility as a member of that committee and as a Member of this House—that in none of the proceedings of the Committee on Banking and Currency neither the bill H.R. 7908 or the so-called "Brown bill", the number of which I do not remember, which was substituted for H.R. 7908, was read. If the bill was not read, and any right of any Member in his legislative capacity was denied to him to discuss each paragraph and offer amendments thereto, then that bill is not properly or legally upon the calendar, and the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency in reporting it out is void.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, there is but one question for the Chair to decide: Is the gentleman from Michigan privileged at this time to call up the McLeod bill on the petition that was signed? This is the sole question. There is no question here involving the integrity of the action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill, reported by that committee, is on the calendar until the Speaker takes it off the calendar. It is properly on the calendar until the Speaker rules that it is not properly on the calendar.

Under the operation of the discharge rule, a committee can be discharged from consideration of a bill only for failure to act. Certainly a committee cannot be discharged from the consideration of a bill when the committee has finished its consideration of the bill and has returned it to the House with its report. The committee has brought the bill back here, has reported it, and the report is before the House. The committee has discharged itself and could not, if it wanted to, further consider the bill. The committee is through with it. The bill as reported is before the House; and this action of the committee absolutely nullifies every action that was taken under the petition to discharge. This is the sole question, so what is the use of wasting the time of the House fooling with a lot of infinitesimal, inconsequential points raised in an effort to impede business and to muddy the waters?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the discharge rule provides for a special procedure.

The question now before the House is not on the rule to discharge; it is on the question of procedure after the petition has been signed by 145 Members. I call the attention of the Chair to page 435 of the Manual. I read therefrom the following:

When Members to the total number of 145 shall have signed the motion, it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the signatures thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referred to the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

Then follows the provision that such a motion can be called up on the second or fourth Mondays of each month; and from page 436 I read the following:

When any motion under this rule shall be called up, the bill or resolution shall be read by title only.

Then the rule recites what the procedure shall be.

Mr. Speaker, the question now before the House is one of procedure. A petition has been signed by 145 Members, as required by this rule. The rule prescribes what the procedure shall be. The gentleman from Michigan has proceeded exactly in accordance with this rule, and there is no provision in the rules that the operation of the discharge rule can be interfered with by any action of any committee of the House. In other words, when this petition has been signed by 145 Members, the procedure shall be as prescribed by this rule, and the rule makes no exception whatever. Whatever any committee may do, the rule brings the matter directly before the House for its attention; and this rule was adopted for that specific purpose.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Does the rule state anywhere that the committee by any action can thwart the will of the 145 Members who signed the petition to discharge?

Mr. DOWELL. It does not. On the contrary, it affirmatively prescribes what the procedure shall be. We are now operating under this rule and the question here is one of procedure and is not on the action of the committee in reporting this bill or on whether or not a report has heretofore been made. As a matter of fact, when this petition was signed by 145 Members, this bill was lying in the committee. The action of the 145 Members in signing this petition immediately put into force this rule; and when the rule is put into force, no action of any committee can operate to nullify this rule.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. In other words, before the committee reported this bill, the petition had been signed by 145 Members.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. And the committee report was not received until today. So, previous to the time the bill was reported the discharge rule had been invoked by the 145 signers of the petition, thus making the motion to discharge the committee in order today.

Mr. DOWELL. The rule states that whenever 145 Members sign a petition this rule is put into effect and jurisdiction is taken from any committee of the House having the bill under consideration. [Applause.] The House by that action took immediate charge of this bill and it is now before the House.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. What is the motion on which the House would be called upon to vote under the contention of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. DOWELL. There will be a motion here.

Mr. BYRNS. What is the motion?

Mr. DOWELL. It follows this rule exactly to discharge the committee.

Mr. BYRNS. I ask the gentleman—the gentleman has the rules before him—what is the motion upon which the House will be called upon to vote?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; it is to proceed in accordance with this rule to take it from the committee and to bring it directly before the House.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman is begging the question. If the gentleman is not willing to be specific in his answer, I will state for him that the motion is a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill.

May I ask the gentleman how in all common sense he is going to discharge a committee when it does not have the bill before it?

Mr. DOWELL. The motion which will be before the House is for the immediate consideration of the bill under this rule.

Mr. BYRNS. No. May I read the rule to the gentleman?

Mr. DOWELL. That is exactly the effect of it.

Mr. BYRNS. May I read the rule to show that it is a motion to discharge the committee? The motion is first

taken up for consideration, and then the bill, if the committee is discharged, will be taken up for consideration. The gentleman will find that at the bottom of page 435 of the Manual.

Mr. DOWELL. This rule specifically provides that nothing shall interfere with the immediate consideration of the bill under this rule.

Mr. BYRNS. Consideration of the motion, not the bill. The motion is to discharge the committee from consideration of the measure.

Mr. DOWELL. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this rule embraces two distinct questions. One is the discharge of the committee and the next is the immediate consideration of the bill. We discharged the committee to get consideration of the bill. We cannot get immediate consideration of the bill under this rule unless we discharge the committee.

Mr. BYRNS. How is the gentleman going to discharge the committee on a bill which has been reported?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not important whether the committee has made a report or not. The report of the committee should not be used to prevent an immediate vote on the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I get clearly before the Chair the very purpose of this rule.

This rule all the way through provides specifically for the immediate consideration and determination of this bill. The whole purpose of it is to take the bill from the committee and bring it before the House. As soon as 145 Members have signed the petition, the bill comes directly before the House on this motion without the action of any committee and under the rule of the House on a certain day this motion shall be called up and then certain definite procedure is outlined. This rule specifically provides for every means by which it can be immediately forced to a conclusion in this House. If there is a majority who do not want to consider it, that is another question, but the question now is on the rule for the consideration of this bill and the action of the committee has nothing to do with the matter.

The whole purpose of this rule and the whole reason for its existence is to get the immediate vote of the House on the bill. Everyone who has been interested in this rule knows that that is the purpose of the rule, and that is why it has been so framed that nothing shall intervene until a final conclusion is had on the bill under consideration.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. Does the gentleman contend that the question before the House is not the discharge of the committee from consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOWELL. The question before the House is to follow the rule bringing this matter now to a vote. The bill was brought before the House by 145 names to the petition. That action brought it directly before the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman read the specific language of the rule?

Mr. DOWELL. This is a question of procedure. May I say that if this rule can be sidetracked or if this rule can be defeated by the action of some other committee or of some committee of this House after 145 names have been signed to the petition which brought the matter before the House, and if it can be taken back and defeated by a committee, then this rule is not what the House intended to have when it passed the rule.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Iowa cannot yield to anyone.

Mr. DOWELL. I am not yielding the floor to anyone. I yield to the gentleman from Maine for a question.

Mr. BEEDY. Has any answer been made to the contention of the gentleman from Iowa other than that there is

now on the calendar a bill which has been reported by the Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will answer if the gentleman will give us a chance.

Mr. BEEDY. Just a moment. I have asked the gentleman from Iowa a question. There is no other answer to the contention of the gentleman from Iowa than that there is a bill on the calendar from the Committee on Banking and Currency. Is that not the fact?

Mr. DOWELL. So far as I know.

Mr. BEEDY. Let me call the attention of the Members of the House to the incorrectness of the view of the gentleman from Tennessee, who claims the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported H.R. 7908, which is now on the calendar. It cannot be refuted here that there was an irregularity in the consideration of this bill by committee. On Friday, the 20th, when the gentleman from Alabama admitted that his committee had met during a session of the House and reported the so-called "McLeod bill", the Speaker, in answering his question as to the regularity of such a proceeding said that the bill was in effect still before the committee. That any irregularity in its consideration renders the committee action void. In the case of Friday, as well as in the case presented today, there is no denial as to the irregularity of the committee's proceeding. I now quote from the ruling of the Speaker on last Friday:

In reply to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will state that the action of the committee in so reporting the bill is absolutely void, and the Chair will direct that the report and the bill be stricken from the calendar. The purported report on the bill H.R. 7908 made to the House on April 12, 1934, being invalid, the Chair holds that the bill is still before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill is never on the calendar if there is irregularity in the proceedings of the committee reporting it. There is no bill from the committee now before the House which can thwart the operation of the discharge rule. Therefore the way is clear, I submit to the Speaker, to bring up the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to discharge the committee.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, if the statements here relative to the action of the committee are correct, some other bill, as I understand it, has been presented to the House. To my mind, it is immaterial whether there is another bill or something else that has been presented.

My position is, and I want the Chair to understand it and I want to emphasize it, when the petition has been signed by 145 Members the bill is taken away, and it follows the procedure of this rule. This is my contention, and I believe it was the contention of the House when it adopted this rule, and I believe the rule should be followed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter upon which the Chair is about to rule. So far as I know it has never been ruled upon, and there are more situations possible to arise under the discharge rule (rule XXVII, subdiv. 4) than the McLeod bill; in fact, I think another somewhat similar situation will arise today immediately following the disposition of this matter.

If the contention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], were sound, the rule in its language would be ridiculous and meaningless.

First, however, let me say that the Chair or this House cannot take cognizance of the statements of fact made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], or the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Beedy], as to what happened in the committee. These facts are not before the Chair or before the House. There is up to this minute no proof of what happened in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

All through this rule is the reference to a motion to discharge a committee. That rule provides that such a motion as is called up today, is a motion to discharge the committee, and as has been said, the committee has already discharged itself. But to proceed further, the rule states that:

If the motion prevails to discharge one of the standing committees of the House from any public bill or resolution pending before the committee—

Of course, this bill does not longer pend before a committee, and to read further from the rule at the bottom of page 436 of the Manual—

Should the House by vote decide against the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution it shall be referred to its proper calendar and be entitled to the same rights and privileges that it would have had had the committee to which it was referred duly reported the same to the House.

And so on throughout the rule, the intent being that the rule does not reach a bill reported from a committee and only reaches a bill which has not been reported.

Further, as you know, in the past few years this question has been discussed many times informally, although the question has never come specifically before the House, as for instance on the bonus legislation and possibly in connection with some other legislation where a committee assumed that by reporting a bill adversely it could defeat the efficacy of the petition to discharge. That, of course, could be done, as was generally agreed among the parliamentarians of the House, to the effect that if the committee reports at all, favorably or adversely, it annuls the petition lying on the desk. In a proposed new rule not yet adopted it is proposed to provide that after a petition is lodged the committee cannot, under the existing rules, report adversely, but right now if the committee reports favorably or adversely it defeats the efficacy of the petition to discharge.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY] has said—
By that method any committee can strangle all legislation.

That statement is not correct under our rules.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman has used my name. Will not the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Was I not correct when I said that if 145 Members have signed a petition for a specific piece of legislation, after the completion of the petition, if a committee reports an amended bill, does not that defeat the purpose of the discharge rule entirely, if the committee sees fit to do this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was just about to state that the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Now, will the gentleman point out to me how I am mistaken?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will permit me, I shall attempt to do so.

There are two features of this discharge rule which were carefully considered and debated upon its adoption. You ladies and gentlemen probably all know that the author was one of the greatest parliamentarians this House ever had, Mr. Crisp, of Georgia. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY] says that if the committee reports a bill immediately after the petition is completed the House is helpless. Of course that is not correct.

The second feature of the rule provides that a petition can then be filed to discharge the Rules Committee from a resolution to consider the bill, and thus force the consideration of the measure, despite any action on the part of the Rules Committee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen anxious for the consideration of this measure do not succeed today, they will, and speedily, propose to do that very thing—petition to discharge the Rules Committee. After 7 days elapse the matter will be before the House. The bill having now been reported from the committee, and that destroying your petition, they can and will now file a resolution with the Rules Committee to make the bill a special order of business.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Will that be satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Please wait until I have completed my statement.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me? The gentleman is convincing me, or trying to convince me.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not answered your question completely.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY] says that when a committee amends a bill it defeats the purpose of

some Members of the House. Of course, the committee does not and could not do that.

This bill as it comes in here reported from the committee or as it will be taken up under a discharge petition directed to the Rules Committee, has the McLeod bill in it. It is physically in the bill. It has merely been amended by the committee. If this House prefers the McLeod bill it can vote down the committee amendments and enact the McLeod bill. The McLeod bill has not been taken away from the House. The McLeod bill will be read to the House first. The committee amendments, which I understand are substantially the Brown bill, will be offered as committee amendments. Those Members who prefer the McLeod bill will vote down the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. In the placing of a petition in the well it is required that a copy of the specific legislation be placed in there, so that the Members signing know they are signing for a specific piece of legislation immediately upon the completion of the petition. If a committee can report in an amended bill or a bill which does not correspond with the exact bill upon which the Members signed the petition, are they not in this way defeating the entire purpose of the petition?

Mr. O'CONNOR. They could do that if it had the power, which it has not. They reported the McLeod bill with committee amendments. They could not physically strike out the entire language of the McLeod bill. That is still in the bill for the consideration of the House.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Let me correct the gentleman. They struck out all of the language. There is nothing left of the McLeod bill but the title. They struck out everything after the enacting clause.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The gentleman from Iowa stated that 145 Members had signed the petition, and that they were on the petition the day the report was made. My impression was to the opposite, and I ask the Speaker to inform the House whether the report was filed before the petition was completed?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair is going to pass on.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the parliamentary procedure, and in order that the Chair may have occasion to comment on one phase of the situation that has not been brought to the attention of the House, I would ask the gentleman from New York whether he is of the opinion that when passing on the application of the rule referring to the motion to discharge the committee, it is within the province of the Chair to pass judgment on the futility that such a motion may come to have? Can it be pressed to a vote that will be fruitless? I hope the Chair will see fit to answer the question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the point of order was that the motion is not now in order.

Mr. LUCE. But the discussion has covered the whole course of the procedure. I hope we may have it clear whether the Chair may pass on the futility of a motion that technically will still be valid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not the province of the Chair to undertake to construe the philosophy of the rule, but only as to the proper parliamentary procedure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, in all this discussion of the parliamentary procedure, we are not passing on the merits of the McLeod bill or any other bill. There is no possible way for any individual or any committee of this House to prevent the ultimate consideration of the proposals contained in the McLeod bill or any other bill. A majority of this House can always function. That is as it should be, but it should function under the established rules of the House. To attempt to enact legislation in direct violation

of the rules would be most disastrous to ourselves and our people.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take but a few minutes. I hope Members will not forget that this is purely a question of parliamentary procedure. The merits or demerits of the bill have absolutely nothing to do with the present question before the House. The rule was adopted for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that was to prevent a committee from undertaking to smother a report. It would be contradictory if this rule prevented a committee from making a report before a motion is taken up. Here is the proposition—you are asked to take 20 minutes under the rule on a motion to discharge the committee, when the committee has not the bill in its possession, and it is on the calendar. It seems to me the question answers itself.

The committee has discharged itself, and so the motion of the gentleman from Michigan falls to the ground. He has his remedy. This does not prevent him from introducing a rule and getting a discharge petition with reference to that rule, and that is what the gentleman proposes to do. I call attention to this one fact, and then I am through. This rule was introduced in a previous term of Congress by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Crisp, at that time a Member of this House, a man recognized as a splendid parliamentarian, one of the best in the House at the time. That gentleman stated in his remarks on the rule with reference to the bonus bill which had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, that it did not apply to the bill. Those favoring the bonus bill abandoned the intention of filing a petition to bring that bill from the Committee on Ways and Means, and adopted the course that I have outlined after 7 days had expired, and the Committee on Rules had failed to take action. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is purely a question of parliamentary procedure, and certainly the House does not want to put itself in the foolish position of debating seriously for 20 minutes a motion to discharge the committee when the committee has already discharged itself.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly? I endeavored to interrogate the majority leader. It seems to me we all agree that the Speaker was correct on Friday last when he ruled the earlier action of that committee was illegal. That left the discharge rule in full operation. The Committee on Banking and Currency, therefore, had no parliamentary right to report the bill now, because it had been discharged from further consideration of that measure, and I hope the Speaker will rule accordingly.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard for just a moment on this. I think it is of tremendous importance. I have been listening attentively to all of these observations, and it seems to me that the question which the Speaker will be called upon to decide is whether if the Banking and Currency Committee came in at a quarter past 12 today with their report and before a quarter past 12 the gentleman from Michigan had moved to discharge the committee, the 145 names being signed, then the gentleman from Michigan would be entitled to bring up the motion to discharge the committee. I merely say this because I hope the Chair will pass on the question of whether the 145 names being signed to the petition gives the right at the moment the one hundred and forty-fifth signature is placed there to permit the gentleman to call up his bill or whether the committee, between the time the one hundred and forty-fifth signature is signed and the next second or fourth Monday, can report the bill and thus defeat the right of the gentleman from Michigan to call up the motion to discharge the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The discharge rule has not been construed in the House up to the present time. It provides:

When Members to the total number of 145 shall have signed the motion it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the

signatures thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees.

That has been done in the instant case. The motion is pending now on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. The question raised is one of procedure. Last Friday a parliamentary inquiry was submitted to the Chair with reference to this same bill. It appeared that the bill had been reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or that that committee had attempted to report it out when the House was in session, that committee having no authority to sit when the House was in session, not having obtained that permission from the House. The Chair held at that time that the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency in reporting out the bill or attempting to report it out under those circumstances was absolutely void, and the bill was still before the committee. The question now arises as to whether the bill is still before the committee. If it is still before the committee, then it is in order to call up the motion to discharge the committee at this time. The question now is whether the committee has the bill yet or not. If the committee still has the bill, it can, of course, be discharged from the consideration of the bill. If the committee has discharged itself by reporting the bill out, another question arises. It appears from the argument that the bill has been reported out and that the committee no longer has the bill before it. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the report on the bill was filed in the House this morning, and the bill was placed on the calendar.

This matter is a rather important one, and the Chair thinks it deserves some consideration at length.

The question presented to the Chair for decision may be stated as follows:

Is the motion to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a bill, as provided in clause 4 of rule XXVII, applicable to a bill that has been reported by a committee during the interval between the placing of the motion to discharge on the calendar and the day when such motion is called up for action in the House?

The discharge rule is what its name implies; that is, a rule providing a method of taking a bill from a committee which has refused to consider or report it. The House has had one form or another of a discharge rule since the Sixty-first Congress. The purpose of all those rules was to provide a method of forcing a committee to report bills instead of pigeonholing them, the theory being that once a bill was placed upon one of the calendars of the House a majority of the House, if it saw fit, could consider it under the general rules of the House.

That was the purpose of the present discharge rule. Mr. Charles R. Crisp, formerly a Member of the House, in discussing the discharge rule on May 10, 1932, said:

The smothering of bills in the committee is what led to the demands for a discharge rule. * * * The discharge rule is needed only to prevent a committee from smothering a bill in the committee room.

It will be clearly seen from the remarks of Mr. Crisp, who who was a very able parliamentarian and who drafted the present rule, that the fundamental purpose of the discharge rule was to provide a method of taking a bill from a committee that refused to consider and report it.

It will be apparent to those who read the present discharge rule that there is no prohibition attaching to a committee to the extent that such committee is forbidden or deprived of the right to report a bill merely because a motion to discharge such a committee from the consideration of a bill has been filed in the House. Nor is there any restriction upon a committee as far as reporting a bill is concerned, even after a motion to discharge has received the requisite number of signatures and the motion has been placed on the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

In other words, a committee of the House has it within its power to report a bill any time it sees fit, notwithstanding the discharge rule. Inasmuch as the purpose of the discharge rule is to compel reports by committees, it would be contradictory to say that the rule should be construed to prevent committees from reporting. Mr. Crisp, on May 10,

1932, addressing himself to this particular point, in reply to a question asked him upon the floor, said:

* * * Of course, the discharge rule now does not apply against the Ways and Means Committee which has reported the bill * * *

In that case the Ways and Means Committee had reported adversely the bonus bill. As Members will recall, the proponents of the bonus bill at that time abandoned their original intention of filing a motion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means, and filed a second motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of the bonus bill. Members recognized at that time—and the present discharge rule was then newly adopted—that the discharge rule could not apply to a case where a committee reported a bill, and thereby divested itself of any jurisdiction over it. Mr. Crisp at that time stated that—

The action of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting the bill adversely has in no wise taken away any of the privileges, rights, or opportunities of the proponents of the measure to bring it up if they can meet the requirements of the rules; and the rules are not adopted for this particular case, but the rules were adopted on the 9th of last December.

Under a fair interpretation of the discharge rule it would seem that where a committee had reported a bill and thereby divested itself of all its authority and jurisdiction over that bill, a motion to discharge such a committee would not be in order. After a committee has reported a bill, it has lost possession of it and it is then in the possession of the House. The House can take any action on such a bill as it sees fit; as a matter of fact, the rules provide an order of business, and the proponents of the bill may utilize the rules for the purpose of getting any reported bill up for consideration. Once a bill is in the possession of the House, the House can always dispose of it as it sees fit, under the general rules of the House.

In order to bring about a condition wherein a committee may be discharged, it is necessary to meet all the requirements of the discharge rule. First, a bill must be in a committee for 30 days before a Member may present a motion to discharge the committee; then such a motion after it is presented must receive 145 signatures of Members. When that is done the motion is placed on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. After the motion has been on that calendar for 7 legislative days any Member who has signed the motion to discharge may on the second or fourth Mondays of a month call up the motion for consideration in the House. If, however, at any time before the House begins consideration of a motion to discharge on the second or fourth Mondays of a month, the committee to which the bill has been referred reports the bill, then the motion to discharge falls by reason of the fact that the committee has by its own action divested itself of its jurisdiction over the bill.

The Chair thinks that inasmuch as the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported the bill, that the effect of that action nullifies the motion to discharge and makes it inoperative.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment to the McLeod bill, so called, was not introduced in the House until the 17th of April subsequent to the time when any bill of the kind was ever read for amendment in the committee. This fact is undenied.

The bill that was reported never was read for amendment in the committee. It is not legally or validly upon the calendar of the House. While the decision of the Chair well presents the fact, assuming that the bill were legally before the House, the Chair has not touched upon the question as to whether it may be in order to call up the discharge rule if the bill attempted to be reported by the committee concerned was not regularly before the House, not having been considered according to the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, therefore, that the bill alleged to have been reported is not legally reported, is

in violation of the rules of the House and of the committees of the House, and has no valid standing in the House.

The SPEAKER. The House passed on that question a few moments ago in a resolution raising the question of the privileges of the House, and passed upon the question adversely to the position taken by the gentleman from Maine.

The Chair has no information as to what occurred in the committee. The only thing the Chair knows is that the McLeod bill, bearing the number it has always borne and with the same title, and with some amendments in which the Chair is not interested, has been reported out, is on the calendar, and can be taken up under the general rules of the House when an opportunity presents itself.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's appeal comes too late, intervening business having been transacted, to wit, a separate, distinct point of order having been made and ruled on by the Chair. Intervening business having been transacted, the gentleman's appeal comes too late.

The SPEAKER. From which point of order is the gentleman from Michigan appealing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the point of order and the remarks of the gentleman from Maine were an interruption of the Chair in view of the fact that the Chair in ruling on the point of order of the gentleman from Maine reiterated the reasons why the Chair so ruled.

Mr. BLANTON. That was separate and distinct business.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is from that, Mr. Speaker, that I respectfully appeal.

The SPEAKER. The time to have appealed from the decision of the Chair was at the time the decision was made. Since that time the gentleman from Maine presented another point of order, a very different point of order and argued it at considerable length, and the Chair made a ruling on that point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Which decision is the gentleman appealing from?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The decision of the Speaker on the point of order made by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, the gentleman from Michigan introduced a resolution known as House Resolution 332, which was referred to the Rules Committee. This is a resolution providing for the consideration of the McLeod bill, and in view of the proceedings here today may I ask now whether it is in order to file a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from the further consideration of this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer the question of the gentleman from Connecticut by saying that it would be in order to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of the resolution after 7 legislative days have passed from the time of its introduction and reference to that committee.

REFUSAL TO SERVE NEGROES IN THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry, which is similar to the one just decided by the Speaker.

On the 24th day of January I filed a resolution in the House. At the expiration of 30 legislative days I prepared a petition to discharge the committee, and laid it on the desk. I subsequently received the necessary 145 signatures on the 23d day of March. After that the Committee on Rules reported the bill out favorably, and I am glad they did.

Under the ruling of the Chair today, if my interpretation is correct, it is impossible to call up this resolution on the Discharge Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will pass on the gentleman's point of order. The Chair feels a different question arises here.

Mr. DE PRIEST. The rule was not enforced last Monday because I was out of the city and I ask that it be allowed to go over. The House very kindly postponed action until I returned to the city. I have been out in Illinois trying to be renominated, and I am happy to say that I succeeded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a rather important question and the Chair will pass on the matter.

Mr. DE PRIEST. I want to find out from the Chair whether the Rules Committee, or any other committee for that matter, can come in and block legislation? I am speaking on the broad, general question now. Can a committee report a bill out, after 145 Members of the House have signed a petition to discharge the committee, and block legislation in this way?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the question when the gentleman is through.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DE PRIEST. This is a very important question and upon the ruling of the Chair today will depend the validity and the effect of the discharge rule. The committee reported out my resolution by striking out the preamble, and I had no objection to that.

This is simply a question of Members knowing their rights in this House under the discharge rule. I understood that this was to come up next Wednesday, and that is perfectly all right with me. May I have a ruling so that we Members especially in the minority group may know where they stand on this rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on this point of order. The question here is not identical with the other situation upon which the Speaker has just ruled, in connection with the McLeod bill.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST] introduced a resolution which was referred to the Rules Committee. It could not have been first referred to any other committee, because that resolution provided for the setting up of a special committee to investigate a certain alleged situation in connection with the conduct of the House restaurant. While his resolution was pending in the Rules Committee, the gentleman filed a petition to discharge that committee, and obtained the necessary 145 signatures. Thereafter the Rules Committee favorably reported the resolution to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood by the House that there was no pressure that could have been exerted on the Rules Committee to report out the gentleman's resolution. The Rules Committee reported the resolution voluntarily because it felt that the matter should be submitted to the House, and, further, because it knew, as every Member should have known, that the gentleman's petition was not worth the paper it was written on. It was completely futile under our rules. No such petition could lie to discharge the Rules Committee from such a resolution. Therefore the action on the part of the Rules Committee was entirely voluntary and not compelled or influenced in any manner by reason of the petition to discharge. The gentleman has not moved to bring up the petition for the reason that undoubtedly he has been advised by his Republican colleagues, more learned in parliamentary procedure, that not only would such a motion not now lie, because the Rules Committee has reported, but further, and for the more vital reason, that his petition was worthless ab initio. Incidentally, such an experience might serve as an example to some Members who sign such petitions indiscriminately.

Under the rules the Rules Committee can only be discharged from consideration of either a special order of

business or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution reported by a committee. The gentleman's resolution was a mere House resolution, which he could not have brought up on a discharge day if he wanted to, as, for instance, 2 weeks ago today or even today. The Rules Committee, realizing full well the futility of the petition and that it could not possibly serve the gentleman's purpose, reported out the resolution in fairness to the gentleman and the House, and for weeks have been prepared to bring up the matter. I personally reported the resolution, with pleasure. It bears my name. I have not called it up before, for the sole reason that the gentleman requested that it not be called up until after his primary election. He also informed the Speaker that he would not return to Washington until the 23d of April, which was yesterday, and did not want the resolution reported from the Rules Committee called up before that date. So all his hullabaloo here today comes as a surprise to us.

I have been trying to arrange to call up the resolution today, tomorrow, or Wednesday of this week at the latest. This arrangement is entirely agreeable to the leaders on the other side of the House.

But what I want understood, Mr. Speaker, is that no attempt has been made to block or sidetrack the gentleman's effort. On the other hand, I want it understood that the Rules Committee reported his resolution voluntarily, a resolution from which it could not have been discharged under the rules.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Will the gentleman kindly tell the Membership of the House when the resolution will come up, if the gentleman can?

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand, the leaders on both sides hope to take it up Wednesday. I would like to take it up today, but Wednesday has been more or less tentatively agreed upon as the first chance it will fit into the program.

Mr. RANSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. RANSLEY. It was virtually agreed to take it up the first free day this week.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it not also true that all rights are protected, because any member of the Rules Committee, whether a member of the majority or minority party, can call the rule up at any time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Surely. The calling up of the resolution has simply been awaiting the return of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST], who made the specific request that we not call up the resolution until his return from the arduous duties of his primary. Now that he has been successfully renominated as the Republican candidate for Representative in the Congress of the United States, he has happily returned. We have patiently waited upon the pleasure of the gentleman and are now ready to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to answer the parliamentary inquiry submitted by the gentleman from Illinois.

The resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois reads:

That a committee of five Members of the House be appointed by the Speaker to investigate by what authority the Committee on Accounts controls and manages the conduct of the House restaurant and by what authority said committee or any members thereof issued and enforced rules or instructions whereby any citizen of the United States is discriminated against on account of race, color, or creed in said House restaurant—

And so forth. The discharge rule we are considering this morning provides very specifically, as follows:

Under this rule it shall also be in order for a Member to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of any resolution providing either a special order of business, or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution, which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action.

The gentleman's resolution which the Chair has just read does not provide for a special order of business or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution, which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action, and, therefore, a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules will not lie, in the judgment of the Chair, under the discharge rule.

OLD-AGE SECURITY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4548) to provide old-age securities for persons over 60 years of age residing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey withhold that so that I may submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 8861) to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question. This is what bill?

Mr. JONES. The sugar bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered over the radio by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the radio address of the Honorable WILLIAM P. CONNERY, Jr., Chairman of the Committee on Labor, as well as my own radio address.

For the first time in the history of our Government, the Democratic majority and our Democratic President have passed legislation to conform to the Jeffersonian theories but contrary to the Republican legislation of the Hamiltonian theories.

For the benefit of the laboring man the Democratic majority has passed various labor legislation, and this has been brought on certain manufacturers owing to their unscrupulous tactics toward their employees.

Although stating they would cooperate with our Government in supporting beneficial measures, they have defied it in many instances. Therefore, in support of the 30-hour work week bill, I wish to point out that because of the speed-up systems which are now being used in their factories by certain manufacturers, this legislation is very necessary in order to spread employment and to bring us such prosperity as we formerly enjoyed.

The addresses above referred to are as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR., APRIL 21 1934

Mr. Chairman and friends: It is gratifying to note the deep and sincere interest which those outside the ranks of industrial workers have taken in problems affecting the welfare of the worker.

The House Committee on Labor, a year ago, unanimously reported a 30-hour work bill to apply to all those workers employed in the manufacturing industries of this country. The Senate of the United States, twice last year voted in favor of limiting the hours of industrial workers to 30 hours per week. Last year we were prevailed upon to give industry an opportunity of putting

its own house in order, with a direct promise that weekly hours of labor would be reduced to a point where the millions of unemployed industrial workers would be provided with gainful employment in industry. That promise has not been kept.

Those in control of manufacturing in this country have not only repudiated their implied promise to the Congress of the United States, but, they have ignored, or, refused the request of the President of the United States, publicly made on March 5, that hours of labor be shortened and wages of industrial workers be increased.

The House Labor Committee has again unanimously reported a 30-hour work week bill with wages to be paid to the workers for 30 hours which they now receive for 40 or more hours per week.

The industrial workers of our country, the Congress of the United States, and the President of the United States were promised by industry that, with the suspension of the antitrust laws, permitting industry to get together legally, that industry would find employment for millions of unemployed industrial workers. What do we find?

The vast majority of codes approved by General Johnson provide for a work week of 40 hours. We are told that the average hours prevailing in 1929 were 50 per week, and some persons try to create the impression that the reduction from 50 hours per week to 40 hours per week would absorb many of the unemployed. The truth is that with the added productivity per worker the average workers today produce more in 40 hours per week than they produced in 50 hours in 1929. The people of America are not blind. There may be some among us who follow the ostrich in the fable, who stuck his head in the sand, hoping that he would not be seen; but from our knowledge of the American people I have no hesitancy in saying that the sooner industry hides its body in the sand and places its head up where it can see what is going on, the sooner will its investments be safeguarded.

Not only are the codes in effect dominated by the employing interests, as they alone govern American industry through their control of code authorities, but contrary to the understanding and intent of Congress very few of these codes provide for any representation of the workers. In passing the National Industrial Recovery Act Congress and the American people understood that the N.R.A. would bring about real partnership in industry on the part of employers with bona fide representatives of the workers. The Connery 30-hour work week bill will make effective this understanding of real partnership in industry as it specifically provides that there shall be equal representation on all codes of both employers and workers.

I am particularly conversant with the industries of my own district, which happen to be basic industries, namely: Textiles, shoes, leather, and electrical products. What are the facts? The textile industry was placed on a 40-hour week under the code, with a minimum wage of \$13 per week in the North and \$12 per week in the South. The textile workers of Massachusetts were not averaging 40 hours per week when the textile codes went into effect, or for many, many months before it. I want to point out that the minimum wage of \$13 per week provided for textile workers in Lawrence increased the wages of very, very few textile workers there.

The reason for this being that the minimum wages prevailing in Lawrence before the code took effect were in excess of the minimum wages provided in the code. In the case of shoes this industry normally employs some 205,000 workers. When the code took effect 160,000 were employees and 45,000 were unemployed. We were promised that the code would provide employment for the unemployed; and, after 6 months of operation, we find that only 4,000 of these unemployed shoe workers have secured employment.

As an illustration, on February 14 of this year I read the following telegram into the record of the hearings on the 30-hour work week bill before the House Committee on Labor:

Congressman WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Forty-hour week has proved useless to leather-tanning industry. More workers unemployed now than at beginning of codes.

DANIEL J. BOYLE,

National Leather Workers Association.

I cite these cases simply as illustrative of what is equally true of all other industries.

After 10 months' trial of the N.R.A., dominated as it is by employers who have continued to exploit the worker and exploit the consumer—without any restraint on the part of the Government—the House Labor Committee unanimously demanded that if the eight or ten millions of unemployed workers of our country are to secure employment, it is essential that Congress enact the 30-hour-work week bill now on the House Calendar, with wages no less than they now receive, which we all will admit are too low.

The Congress, to my mind, fully realizes the necessity of forcing American industries to do that which the President of the United States asked them to do, and which they have not done. The farmers of America are suffering at the present time owing to the lack of purchasing power on the part of our industrial workers. In passing, I want to compliment the Washington representatives of the farm organizations for their foresight in endorsing the Connery 30-hour work week bill. They realize that they can hardly expect to receive the costs of production for their products with from eight to ten millions of industrial workers unemployed, or dependent upon private or public charities.

Incidentally, let me say that the Congress of the United States has never sanctioned the formation of company-controlled unions under the N.R.A. On June 8, 1933, under the leadership of Senators NORRIS and WHEELER in the Senate, and myself and other Members of the House, Congress specifically rejected an amendment which would have legalized company unions.

To all real Americans who desire to assist in promoting the welfare of our country, the one vital and absorbing question is that of providing our millions of unemployed with gainful employment at a fair living wage. At this time the only legislative manner in which this can be done is the immediate passage of the Connery 30-hour work week bill with the same wages for 30 hours that they now receive for longer periods.

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN LESINSKI, APRIL 15, 1934

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience—

I have been afforded the privilege to speak over this station and am taking the liberty to deliver my message to the listeners and endeavor to explain section 7-A of the National Recovery Act.

The feeling and the unrest among the labor ranks is due to the fact that many of the laborers have been exploited through the speed-up system in our industries inasmuch as the industries in their continuous competition have attempted to produce products at a continual reduction of price, so that not only the domestic trade, but also the foreign trade would absorb our products on account of the low price.

Industry has forgotten one fundamental part, and that is—that by constantly attempting to lower the price of the commodity that is manufactured, the cost must be taken out of labor and the industries knowing that the present Government's desire is to increase the wage-earner's income, many of them have cooperated with the Government to that extent; but by so doing, they have speeded up the production per man to such a point that today an employee in many of the factories is only a mechanical machine working at a top speed, which in no way aids the welfare of the worker but makes him a mechanical slave.

The average worker is only able to give so many years of his life to the industry; and by the time he reaches the age of 40 years he is no more wanted, as the industry has taken the best part of his life and no longer considers him efficient. There is only one solution to this—and that is, that the industry must be fair to its employees and slow down the production lines, which, of course, will put many more men to work and will naturally add to the cost of the product. I realize fully, that the industry is not willing to do this, and on account of its stand the present unrest and dissatisfaction among the employees exist.

The present government has done more for the laborer than any other previous government has done for many years. When section 7-A became a part of the National Recovery Act, it was not put there as a gesture. It was placed on the statute books of this country for the benefit of labor, and it is up to labor to use it fully, and the Government is willing to use its offices for the benefit of labor when such demand is made. This procedure, of course, is slow, but in a long run it is the best, because both the employee and employer should have a certain amount of time to settle their differences which arise when demands are made either by the employer of the laborer, or employee of the manufacturer.

Realizing that the unemployment situation in this area has been beyond the comprehension of many people, and knowing that the labor cannot constantly wait until all arguments between themselves and the employers are settled, many temporarily resort to strikes, as that is the only remedy left for the employee. Relative to this matter, I still would say to the laborer that before an attempt is made to force any employer to agree to the demands of labor by striking, that labor should first use the machinery of the Government to settle their differences before they resort to other means of forcing the employer to give heed to their demands.

Being an employer for many years myself, I have always followed a rule which I personally thought was best for my business, and that was by seeing that my employees were always paid fair wages, as by paying them a fair wage I knew that I was creating a power which not only helped my business, but helped merchants along the avenue, who in turn became customers of mine. I think that the manufacturers should do likewise and treat their employees the same way.

It is up to all of us to do our share to restore prosperity back to this Nation by following a certain course and willingness to cooperate fully with the Government for the benefit of both labor and manufacturer.

I know that the President is keenly interested to bring about the recovery of the whole Nation, and he is also greatly interested that the labor should be allowed the American standard of living. A few days before I left Washington I corresponded with him regarding the situation of the speed-up system of our factories and presented to him these matters as I thought were for the benefit of the laborers. His reply to me reads as follows:

"Thank you for your note of March 24. I know a good deal about the speed-up system and that in many cases it has been carried too far in certain industries. It occurs to me, however, that it would be more practical to ask the Department of Labor to make a preliminary study of the problem. I think the Department is equipped to do this. Later on, after such a study has been made, we could determine whether a congressional investigation was or was not desirable."

I have since taken this matter up with the Labor Department and have a promise that an investigation is going to be made. I fully realize that if the speed-up systems and mass productions are not checked, it will be a long time before we can expect a full recovery of this Nation.

I am attempting to show labor that everything possible is being done for its benefit; but, of course, we also realize that labor must be fair in its demands and should not overstep its bounds and create unemployment. At the present time, in this district, or in this territory, the major portion of our labor is not organized, and I believe that great consideration should be given the welfare of its families; and for that reason I am asking labor to go along cautiously, and believe that by using the proper agencies of the Government they eventually will not only gain their point but the manufacturer will also be satisfied to go along on a program of this type.

I also realize, of course, that all the employers do not want to abide by any actions of the Government, as evidenced by the facts in the coal industry. An agreement has been reached with the producers on hours and wage scale, and a statement made by Forney Johnston, coal operator, reads as follows:

"As between the civil war in the industry and subjection of the industry to three proconsuls working through a military ringmaster, we prefer civil war."

Speaking at the closing session of the Recovery Administration's coal-wage hearing, Johnston said:

"So far as we are concerned, we have definitely and finally determined that we will not conform any further to any one-man determination of policy and dictation in repudiation of essential basis and covenant of the code."

If industry will take this type of stand, then there will be nothing else left for Congress or the Government to do but to make a law enforcing all the laws, which would then upset the condition in this country of free speech and the collective bargaining between the employee and the employer.

The industry must realize that the Government has been very lenient not to upset the traditions of the Government; but if that employer will take a stand as the Alabama coal operators did, then there is nothing left for the Government to do but enact laws which will force the employer to abide by the law as it is written. When the National Industrial Recovery Act was enacted, it was not only to protect organized labor or the unions, but it was also intended for the benefit of all employees to have the right of collective bargaining. The employees of any individual plant, if they so elect, can form their own organization in that particular industry free from any intimidation of the employer.

The employer has no right to help organize nor has he any right to prepare bylaws for the employees. The employee in this case must stand on his own right and can demand in the particular industry in which he is employed that an organization be formed by the employees, and through their efforts only. The reason for this is so that the collective bargaining between employer and employee is free from intimidation or coercion.

I also wish to say that I am always at the service of both the laborer and employer, and my office is open at all times to all my constituents, be they laborers or manufacturers.

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein certain figures compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board concerning the distribution of the national income and which are useful in the consideration of tax matters and public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following figures, compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board, concerning the distribution of the national income, which are useful in the consideration of tax matters and public business.

Distribution of national income produced and paid out, 1929 and 1932

	1929		1932		Percent decline per capita, 1929 to 1932
	Amount, in millions	Per capita	Amount, in millions	Per capita	
Total income produced.....	\$83,032	\$1,877	\$39,365	\$1,153	38.6
Net gain or loss of capital assets.....	+1,896		-9,529		
Total income paid out.....	81,136	(¹)	48,894	(¹)	
Paid to employees in wages, salaries, etc.....	52,793	1,500	31,533	1,239	17.4

¹ Number of individuals not known.

*Distribution of national income produced and paid out, 1929
and 1912—Continued*

	1929		1932		Percent decline per capita, 1929 to 1932
	Amount, in millions	Per capita	Amount, in millions	Per capita	
Total income paid out—Con.					
Paid to farmers, withdrawn by business proprietors and professional persons, and net rents and royalties.....	\$16,136	(1)	\$3,890	(1)	77.8
To farmers ¹	5,574	\$1,002	1,291	\$222	
Other.....	10,562	(1)	7,599	(1)	
Paid as interest and dividends and net income from abroad.....	12,206	(1)	8,472	(1)	
To savings institutions, and directly as interest and dividends to individuals with net incomes of less than \$10,000 ²	7,501	(1)	6,925	(1)	
Interest and dividends paid directly to individuals represented in returns of net income of \$10,000 and over ³	4,705	(1)	1,547	(1)	

¹ Number of individuals not known.

² Net income available for farm operators' labor, capital, and management, estimated by the Department of Agriculture.

³ Obtained by subtraction.

⁴ From Statistics of Income, Treasury Department, interest partly estimated for 1929.

⁵ Partly estimated.

Number of gainful workers reduced to equivalent number of fully employed
[Thousands]

	1929	1932
Agriculture:		
Entrepreneurs.....	5,565	5,804
Employees.....	2,027	1,484
Total.....	7,592	7,288
All other industries:		
Entrepreneurs.....	3,455	2,873
Employees.....	33,178	23,969
Total.....	36,633	26,843
All industries:		
Entrepreneurs.....	9,020	8,677
Employees.....	35,205	25,453
Total.....	44,225	34,131

**NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD,
New York, April 19, 1934.**

Total tax collection, Federal, State, and local, in the United States in 1932 were equal to 20.3 percent of the total national income of the American people, according to computations announced today by the National Industrial Conference Board in a study of the burden of taxation in the United States and European countries. In 1929, total tax collections in the United States were equal to 11.8 percent of the national income.

In the period from 1929 to 1932 the ratio of taxes to national income increased in three European countries as follows: United Kingdom, from 21 to 28 percent; Germany, from 19 to 22 percent; and France, from 23 to 25 percent.

American tax collections in 1932, the last year for which comparable data are available, were almost equal to the combined total of the three European countries, the figures being as follows: United States, \$8,000,000,000; United Kingdom, \$4,400,000,000; Germany, \$2,400,000,000; France, \$2,300,000,000.

Aggregate tax collections in the United States reached an all-time peak of \$10,300,000,000 in 1930. Of this total Federal taxes accounted for \$3,500,000,000; States taxes, \$1,800,000,000; and local taxes, \$5,000,000,000. In 1932, Federal taxes amounted to \$1,800,000,000; States, \$1,700,000,000; and local, \$4,500,000,000. The principal factor in the decline in total tax collections after 1930 was the marked drop in Federal taxes, particularly income taxes and customs. Federal tax returns for the fiscal year 1933 were at the 1932 level, and for 1934 the indications are that collections will be substantially higher.

The ratio of taxes to national income was almost constant in the United States in the predepression years, 1926 to 1929, moving no lower than 11 percent nor higher than 11.8 percent. In 1929, taxes totaled \$9,800,000,000, compared with total national income of \$83,000,000,000. Taxes increased to \$10,300,000,000 in 1930, while national income decreased to \$70,300,000,000, with the result that the ratio of taxes to national income rose to 14.6 percent. In the

next 2 years taxes fell off to \$8,000,000,000, but national income dropped even more rapidly, to \$39,400,000,000, and the ratio for 1932 rose to 20.3 percent, the highest figure on record.

LOCKS IN THE OHIO RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 9265) prescribing tolls to be paid for the use of locks in the Ohio River and its tributaries has been referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I am of opinion it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Parliamentarian agrees with me. I therefore ask that the measure may be withdrawn from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AIR- AND OCEAN-MAIL CONTRACTS OF THE SENATE

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Printing I send to the desk a privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S.Con.Res. 13).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee on Air and Ocean Mail Contracts of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,500 additional copies of each and all parts of the testimony taken before said special committee during the Seventy-third Congress in connection with its investigation of air-mail and ocean-mail contracts: Provided, That 10 copies shall be distributed to each Senator.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 9, strike out the proviso reading, "Provided, That 10 copies shall be distributed to each Senator."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the lady from New Jersey is to take up a most important bill, and I think we should have a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Allgood	Disney	Hoidale	Oliver, Ala.
Bacharach	Doughton	Imhoff	Peavey
Bailey	Douglass	James	Peterson
Beck	Doutrich	Jeffers	Pierce
Bloom	Drewry	Jenckes, Ind.	Plumley
Boland	Eaton	Jenkins, Ohio	Rayburn
Bolton	Flannagan	Johnson, W.Va.	Reid, Ill.
Boylan	Focht	Kennedy, Md.	Rogers, N.H.
Brennan	Foulkes	Kennedy, N.Y.	Romjue
Britten	Fulmer	Kvale	Sadowski
Brooks	Gasque	Lanham	Schaefer
Browning	Gillespie	Larrabee	Shallenberger
Burke, Calif.	Goldsborough	Lea, Calif.	Shoemaker
Cady	Green	Lesinski	Sirovich
Cannon, Wis.	Greenway	Lindsay	Smith, W.Va.
Carley	Greenwood	Lloyd	Stokes
Carpenter, Nebr.	Griffin	McCarthy	Sullivan
Celler	Haines	McCormack	Sutphin
Church	Hamilton	McDuffie	Swick
Claiborne	Harlan	McLeod	Thurston
Collins, Miss.	Hartley	McMillan	Treadway
Condon	Hastings	McSwain	Turpin
Cooper, Ohio	Hess	Marland	Vinson, Ky.
Corning	Hildebrandt	Merritt	Wadsworth
Crosby	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Waldron
Crowther	Hill, Knute	Montague	Withrow
Cummings	Hill, Samuel B.	Nesbit	
Dickstein	Hoepfel	O'Connell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to; and the doors were opened.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the following Members are in attendance on a subcom-

mittee of the Committee on Military Affairs: Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire, Mr. HILL of Alabama, Mr. JAMES, Mr. Goss, and Mr. KVALE.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—M'ANDREWS V. BRITTEN

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, presented a privileged report in the contested-election case of *James McAndrews v. Fred A. Britten*, which was referred to the calendar and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made Saturday night by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Tugwell, which gives his philosophy of government, which has been of so much interest to the minority side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to any of Mr. Tugwell's philosophy going in the RECORD. In my opinion, his so-called "Tugwell bill" would have closed up every country drug store in the United States, and would have put out of business every country newspaper. He did a great injustice to a high class, highly respected mineral-water business in my district, at Mineral Wells, Tex., which has been curing afflicted people from all over the United States for nearly a hundred years. He had this product in his "Chamber of Horrors" at Chicago until we forced him to take it out. I do not like his philosophy.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I will renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4548) to provide old-age securities for persons over 60 years of age residing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. And pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STALKER] and one half by myself.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the bill is of so great importance it ought to be debated generally under the rules of the House, and I shall be forced to object to the unanimous-consent request.

The motion of Mrs. NORTON was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be established in the District of Columbia an Old Age Security Board, hereafter referred to as the board, to be composed of the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who will serve without additional compensation during their term of office.

Sec. 2. The board shall perform all the duties imposed upon it by this act and shall have authority to appoint such persons and to make such rules and regulations consistent with the provisions hereof as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The board shall meet at such times and places as shall be fixed by its rules.

Sec. 3. Every person (man or woman, married or single) shall, while residing in the District of Columbia, be entitled to a security in old age, subject to the restrictions and qualifications herein-after noted.

Sec. 4. The amount of said security shall be the amount which when added to the income of the applicant will make the total income of an applicant not to exceed \$9 per week.

Sec. 5. A security may be granted only to an applicant who (a) is a citizen of the United States; (b) has attained the age of 60 years or upward; (c) resides and has his domicile in the District of Columbia, and has so resided and had his domicile continuously therein for not less than 10 years immediately preceding the date of the application for a security; *Provided*, That continuous residence in the District of Columbia shall not be deemed to have been interrupted by occasional absences therefrom where the total period of such absences does not exceed 4 years; (d) that the claimant is not at the time an inmate of any prison, jail, workhouse, insane asylum, or any other public reformatory, or correctional institution.

Sec. 6. The income of the claimant from all sources at the date of application for relief shall not exceed \$468 per annum; and the value of his property or the value of the combined property of husband and wife living together shall not exceed \$3,000.

(a) The claimant must not have deprived himself, directly or indirectly, of any property for the purpose of qualifying for old-age relief.

(b) The aged person must have no child or any other person legally responsible for the support of the aged person under the laws of the District of Columbia fully able to support the applicant.

(c) At the death of the person to whom the security is granted, or of the last survivor of a married couple, the total amount of the security since the first grant, together with 3 percent of interest, shall be deducted and allowed by the proper courts out of the proceeds of his property as a preferred claim against the estate of the person so assisted, and refunded to the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia Relief Aid Fund, leaving the balance for distribution among the lawful heirs in accordance with law: *Provided*, That upon sufficient cause, such as mismanagement, failure to keep in repair, or the inability to properly manage such property, the board may demand the assignment or transfer of such property upon the first grant of such security or at any time thereafter that it deems advisable for the purpose of safeguarding the interest of an applicant or a security certificate recipient or for the protection of the funds of the State. The board shall establish such rules and regulations regarding the care, transfer, management, and sale of such property as it deems advisable, and also provide for the return of the balance of the claimant's property into its hands whenever the pension is withdrawn or the claimant ceases to request it.

Sec. 7. The annual income of any property, inclusive of a homestead, shall be computed at 3 percent of its determined value.

(a) In ascertaining a claimant's income and the amount of security, his income for the past preceding year shall be deemed his annual income, and the property owned at the end of that year as his accumulated property: *Provided*, That when the claimant shows to the satisfaction of the board the loss of personal income derived from personal earnings it shall be deducted from the income of the preceding year in considering the amount of security to be granted.

Sec. 8. A claimant for an old-age security under this act shall deliver his claim in writing to such person or persons as may be authorized by the board, the same to be forwarded to the board within 10 days, together with such recommendations as are considered consistent with the rules and regulations of the board, or said application may be filed with the board.

Sec. 9. When the claim is established and the rate of the first year's old-age security is fixed the board shall, in the manner it may prescribe, certify same to the Secretary of the Treasury, together with the claimant's name, residence, age, the amount of weekly payments, the date of issuance, and who shall draw his order on the United States Treasury.

(a) The old-age security certificate shall be required each subsequent year, to be renewed after satisfactory investigation.

Sec. 10. The old-age security shall commence on the date named in the certificate issued to the claimant. A decision shall be made within 30 days after claim is filed.

(a) All old-age securities shall be paid in monthly payments by warrants drawn on the District of Columbia Aid Relief Fund thereof.

Sec. 11. If at any time during the currency or continuance of an old-age security certificate the recipient, or the wife or husband of the recipient, becomes possessed of any property or income in excess of the amount allowed by law in respect to the amount of security granted, the board may on inquiry either cancel the security or vary the amount thereof during the period of the certificate, and it shall be the duty of the recipient immediately to notify the board of the receipt and possession of such property or income.

(a) If on the death of any recipient of an old-age security it is found that he was possessed of property in excess of the amount allowed by law in respect to the amount of security granted, double the total amount of the relief granted in excess of that to which the recipient was by law entitled may be recovered by the board as preferred claim from the estate so found in excess. The Attorney General shall take the necessary proceedings to recover such claims and the amount so recovered shall be paid into the United States Treasury.

Sec. 12. On the death of a recipient of old-age security the installments then accruing, and such other reasonable funeral expenses as are necessary for the burial of such person, shall be paid to such person or persons as the board directs: *Provided*, That these expenses do not exceed \$100: *Provided further*, That the estate of the deceased is insufficient to defray the expenses: *And provided further*, That these provisions for providing old-age securities shall not be construed as a vested right in the security recipient.

Sec. 13. During the continuance of the old-age security no recipient shall receive any other relief from the District of Columbia except for medical and surgical assistance.

Sec. 14. All securities shall be absolutely inalienable by any assignment, sale attachment, execution, or otherwise, and in case of bankruptcy the old-age security shall not pass to any trustee or other persons acting on behalf of creditors.

Sec. 15. If at any time the board has reason to believe that any security certificate has been improperly obtained, it shall cause special inquiry to be made and may suspend payment of any installment pending the inquiry. If, on inquiry, it appears that the certificate was improperly obtained, it shall be canceled.

by the board, but if it appears that the certificate was properly obtained, the suspended installment shall be payable in due course.

SEC. 16. Any person, who by means of a willfully false statement or representation, or by impersonation, or other fraudulent device, obtains or attempts to obtain, or aids or abets any person to obtain (a) an old-age security certificate to which he is not justly entitled, (b) a larger amount of assistance than that to which he is justly entitled, (c) payment of any forfeited installment grant, (d) or aids or abets in the buying or in any way disposing of the property of an old-age security recipient, without the consent of the board, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both.

SEC. 17. Where on old-age security recipient is convicted of an offense under section 16, the board may cancel the security certificate in respect to the issue of which the offense was committed.

(a) When a claimant has received a notice that his claim for a security has been denied he shall have the right to personally appear before the board to defend his claim for a security after due notice has been made to the board of such desire.

SEC. 18. In case of forfeiture of any old-age security certificate the person whose security is so forfeited shall be disqualified from making an application for a new certificate until the expiration of 1 year from the date of forfeiture.

SEC. 19. The funds for the payment of old-age securities shall be furnished by the District of Columbia and all expenses incurred in the administration of the act by the board shall be paid from the funds of the District of Columbia Aid Relief Fund, which shall be established, the funds to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States. The sum of \$— is hereby appropriated for said purposes.

SEC. 20. Within 90 days after the close of the calendar year the board shall make a report of the preceding year to the President, stating (a) the total number of recipients; (b) the amount paid in cash; (c) the total number of applicants; (d) the number granted securities, the number denied, the number canceled during the year, and such other information as the President may deem advisable.

SEC. 21. All methods of procedure in hearings, investigations, recording, registration, and accounting pertaining to the old-age securities under this act shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations as laid down from time to time by the board.

SEC. 22. Every old-age security granted under the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be granted and shall be held subject to the provisions of any amending or repealing act that may hereafter be enacted, and no recipient under this act shall have any claim for compensation or otherwise by reason of his old-age security being affected in any way by any such amending or repealing act.

SEC. 23. That whenever in this act the masculine pronoun is used, it shall be held to include the feminine pronoun also.

SEC. 24. This act shall be named and cited as the Old Age Security Act of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 25. This act shall take effect January 1, 1934: *Provided, however,* That said Old Age Security Board shall be appointed on or before July 1, 1934, and thereupon said board shall perform all the duties required by this act from date of said appointment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, section 4, line 11, strike out "\$9" and insert "\$35". Strike out "week" and insert "month".

Page 2, section 5, line 14, strike out "sixty" and insert "sixty-five".

Page 3, section 6, lines 9 to 11, strike out subsection (b). Line 13, strike out (c) and insert (b).

Page 6, section 11, lines 11 and 12, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "Corporation Counsel".

Page 10, section 25, line 3, strike out "January" and insert "July".

During the reading of the foregoing bill the following occurred:

Mrs. NORTON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. This is such an important bill that we should have the provisions of the bill printed at length in the RECORD at this place, so that the membership and the country may know its provisions as they are read. It is only 10 pages long, and I object.

The Clerk continued the reading.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I move that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members present, a quorum, and the Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk continued with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that there is not a quorum here now. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, so that we may get the Members in out of the cloakrooms.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members present, a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers on that.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUNN. May I ask the Members who are now present please to stay here and make a quorum so that we can dispose of this humanitarian piece of legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers on that vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that its count can be impeached from the floor in committee. The Clerk will continue with the reading.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. I find it very difficult to understand why every committee in this House is treated courteously until the Committee on the District of Columbia comes in with a bill that is not approved by certain Members of the House. Two weeks ago I had this bill on the calendar. I was asked at that time by a certain Member not to bring up the bill on that day. We had a great many other bills of importance on the calendar and we thought that we would dispose of those bills first. I did so, with the understanding that the bill would be brought up today, that it would be a special order of business. I ask no concessions from any Member of this House, but I do want plain, simple justice. [Applause.] This certain Member who objected to the bill came to me and the reason he gave me for objecting—and please bear this in mind—was that he did not have any such law in his State and that as it was a congressional year, and he was coming up for election it would probably put him in a very embarrassing position there. Of course, I feel very sorry for any Member who is having a hard time in the election. I may have a hard time myself and I would want all the cooperation that I could get from the House to support me, if I deserved it, but does any Member of this House think that that is a fair reason for depriving the old people of the District of Columbia of a pension bill? Does any Member of the House think that is the proper procedure? I cannot believe it. I want to know if this House is going to support the Members who have worked very faithfully on District matters, or if it is possible that one Member can frustrate the work that we are trying to do? I have tried to be absolutely fair in my dealings with every committee.

I recall last week, when the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations had under consideration the District appropriation bill here, there were many parts of that bill that I strongly objected to and which I should like to have seen amended. I could have done, or any Member could have done, exactly what is being done here today, namely, filibuster all day long and make it impossible for the committee to finish its work, but I did not believe that that was the fair way to proceed. If a bill is to be rejected, let it be rejected by the Membership of the House on its merits, but it is not fair to reject it because one or two Members in the House oppose it for personal reasons. Therefore I did not make points of no quorum when the District appropriation bill was under consideration, although I may say that there were many times when I should like to have done so. I did not consider that that was a fair way to proceed. Today I think we have been subjected to the most unfair treatment that has ever been witnessed in this

House and I appeal to the membership to sustain the Committee on the District of Columbia and to give this bill a chance to be voted up or down upon its merits.

I want now to explain something about the bill. I do not think it is necessary to call the attention of the membership of the House to the importance of this bill. We have here a bill taking care of old people. In 28 States of the Union at the present time there is a similar bill, and in every State which we have investigated we have found that it costs less to keep the people in their own homes and give them this so-called "pension" than it does to send them to institutions. If for no other reason than that, the bill should pass; but there is another reason, and I think a very much more humane one, why the bill should pass. I do not know whether any of you have ever had experience with aged dependent people. Before I came to Congress I gained some knowledge of this question as chairman of the county institution in my own county, and I saw many sights that led me to believe that while institutional care is very good and at times absolutely necessary, particularly in case of illness, it is not in any sense to be compared with keeping these old people in their own homes.

This bill merely provides \$35 a month in order to keep these people in their own homes. You know and I know that in these days of stress many people have found it necessary to apply for help who never dreamed of doing so before. We are living in a different age, under different conditions; and none of us knows when the day may come that we, too, may have to appeal for support from somebody. If you have children who are able to support you, that is very fine; but there are many children today who, with all the good intentions in the world, find it impossible to help their fathers and mothers. If they could do so, they should be obliged to do so. If, however, they cannot help them, surely these aged people should not suffer in this, the Capital of the wealthiest Nation in the world. If the Government contributes \$35 a month, that father or mother, instead of being a liability, becomes an asset; and certainly they can be very much happier surrounded by their dear ones than they can when sent to Blue Plains or any other institution where old people are kept together.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Gladly.

Mr. PARSONS. From what source will come the funds to establish this relief?

Mrs. NORTON. From the District of Columbia funds.

Mr. PARSONS. How will it be raised?

Mrs. NORTON. In the usual way that all District funds are raised.

Mr. PARSONS. In the regular tax rate?

Mrs. NORTON. Exactly.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. I notice on page 3 of the bill the committee struck out this language:

The aged person must have no child or any other person legally responsible for the support of the aged person under the laws of the District of Columbia fully able to support the applicant.

Will the lady give us the reason why this language was stricken from the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; the language was stricken because there is no such law in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ARNOLD. Should there not be such a law in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. NORTON. I think so; but, of course, such a bill would have to be reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the bill should carry language which would eliminate those who have children able to support them.

Mrs. NORTON. The committee did not feel that it was proper to leave that language in the bill, inasmuch as there

is no law to compel children to support parents. However, I shall be very glad to accept an amendment covering the point the gentleman has in mind if he will prepare one.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will keep that in mind. If the gentlewoman will permit a further question, the gentlewoman said, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that funds to provide for this relief must come from taxes levied against property in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. NORTON. Exactly. Of course, the gentleman knows the Government makes a small contribution to the District funds.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And is no part of it to come from Federal contributions or Federal appropriations for the operation of the District?

Mrs. NORTON. It will come from District of Columbia funds.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And no part will come from the Federal Treasury?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not know exactly what the gentleman means by that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to know definitely whether any part of the funds for the support of these pensioners is to come from the Federal Treasury?

Mrs. NORTON. My understanding is that it does not. When the Federal Government makes a contribution to the District it belongs to the District.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. A provision should be inserted in the bill specifying that no part of the funds shall come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. GLOVER. I am vitally interested in this principle of legislation both for the District of Columbia and for the States. I was just wondering if the gentlewoman had made a survey of the city and is able to inform the House about how many persons would be cared for, and whether or not the District funds at this time are sufficient to carry the amount that is proposed in the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that the District funds are not now sufficient. We would, of course, be obliged to authorize the District to use additional funds for this purpose.

Mr. GLOVER. How many people would be affected by the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. According to a recent survey and estimate 1,240 men and women would be eligible for this pension.

The estimated average annual cost per person is \$200. The total cost, therefore, would be \$248,000 on the figures at present available; and this is much less than the cost per person at Blue Plains.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested in the rate. The State of Michigan recently passed legislation of this character and fixed the rate at \$30 per month. Could the gentlewoman inform the House why it was fixed at \$35 in the District of Columbia? Is it because of higher costs of living?

Mrs. NORTON. Living costs are higher in Washington. Living costs in Washington are comparable to those in New York and most of the eastern cities.

Mr. DONDERO. One more question: I notice that the tax rate has been reduced to \$1.20.

Mrs. NORTON. No; it has not been reduced. An effort was made to reduce it, but the rate was not reduced.

I may say that in my own State, New Jersey, we have found that it is considerably cheaper to keep people in their own homes than it is to maintain them in institutions.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia endorse the principle of this legislation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentlewoman inform the House a little more fully with regard to the operation of this

law in her own State? What is the amount per person, and what is the age at which the relief starts?

Mrs. NORTON. For the present year the annual appropriation for my State per person was \$177.60.

That was the rate in New Jersey.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Fifteen dollars in New Jersey; and \$35 is the amount in the pending bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; but we provide in this bill that the \$35 includes all of the income that an applicant must have. In other words, if an applicant had \$2, \$3, or \$10 a month income from some other source, this would be deducted from the \$35 granted by the District.

Mr. McFARLANE. Did I understand the gentlewoman to say that in New Jersey the average was \$177 a year?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. That would be a little less than \$15 per month.

Mrs. NORTON. That is the average annual pension.

Mr. McFARLANE. And \$177 a year is a little over \$14 per month.

Mrs. NORTON. That is about the average for the State; the counties make their contribution.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentlewoman explain the New Jersey provision inasmuch as she has brought the matter up? What is the minimum age in order to obtain a pension in the gentlewoman's State?

Mrs. NORTON. The minimum age in my State is about 65 years. That is the minimum age in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How do they get \$24 when the total amount on the average per year is less than \$180?

Mrs. NORTON. I presume that is the average. They have not applied probably for more than that. I am merely quoting the average.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What does the investigation show as to the amounts paid in other States?

Mrs. NORTON. The Department of Labor has furnished these statistics.

State	Average annual pension	Average annual cost of poorhouse care per inmate	Sav'ing to taxpayer per pensioner
California.....	\$275.28	\$484.12	\$208.84
Delaware.....	113.91	495.62	381.71
Idaho.....	132.21	528.52	396.31
Kentucky.....	60.00	295.95	235.95
Maryland.....	332.38	459.79	127.41
Massachusetts.....	312.00	539.33	227.33
Minnesota.....	192.36	631.86	439.50
Montana.....	158.35	634.19	475.84
Nevada.....	300.00	949.16	649.16
New Hampshire.....	232.79	503.72	270.93
New Jersey.....	177.60	479.86	302.26
New York.....	302.88	405.59	102.71
Utah.....	116.76	512.33	395.57
Wisconsin.....	236.04	399.99	163.95
Wyoming.....	170.66	908.68	738.02

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the age?

Mrs. NORTON. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What are the minimum property qualifications?

Mrs. NORTON. I cannot answer that question. Perhaps the gentlewoman from California can tell us something about that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We would like to have some information.

Mrs. KAHN. I do not know anything about that feature.

Mr. BLACK. The minimum rate shows the cost on the taxation basis as against the cost on the poorhouse basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

In Wisconsin the average has been \$236.04 for the year. The average cost of the poorhouse care in that State was \$399.99. It is contended that they have saved \$163.95 through having this pension.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate that and understand the principle involved, but what I am trying to ascertain

is the amount allowed pensioners who have no property, income, or children responsible for their support in the various States where the pension law has been adopted.

Mrs. NORTON. I have not that information. If the gentleman would like to have me secure the information, I will do so and include it in the Record.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Has the gentlewoman any definite information for any particular State?

Mrs. NORTON. What is the particular question that the gentleman wishes to ask?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My particular question is the amount allowed a person 65 years of age in New Jersey or any other State.

Mrs. NORTON. The amount allowed in my State is \$14.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The amount allowed in Pennsylvania is \$30.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For what age?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Seventy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the average amount paid?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I may say that this law has been passed, but does not take effect until December.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am wondering if someone can give us the information as to the definite amount allowed pensioners 65 years of age or over.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. May I say to the gentleman that I have sent for a book which will give the information as to all the States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What was the poorhouse charge per person?

Mrs. NORTON. The poorhouse charge—and this is a comparison per inmate—is \$42.13.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The gentlewoman quoted the amount paid out and the amount allowed by law?

Mrs. NORTON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentlewoman quoted figures from the State of Wisconsin?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. May I ask the gentlewoman where she obtained those figures? I should also like to get the amount given, and to learn where she obtained the figures.

Mrs. NORTON. This shows the number of pensioners as of December 31, 1933, for Wisconsin as 1,760. I obtained them from the most recent poorhouse investigation made by the Department of Labor.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Old-age pensions paid in Wisconsin?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. By the State?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. The average pension per annum is \$236.04. The poorhouse cost in the gentleman's State was \$399.99—a saving to Wisconsin taxpayers of \$163.95 per pensioner.

Mr. O'MALLEY. May I inquire where the gentlewoman obtained these figures, because I did not know that the pensions were paid by the State? I thought they were being paid by the county.

Mrs. NORTON. It may be that the county is contributing to the State fund. My statistics are from the Department of Labor.

Mr. O'MALLEY. In my State the situation has been that the counties are supposed to be helped by the State, but, the State not having the money, the counties are still paying it.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman I think that is true in a great many States.

Mr. O'MALLEY. And I cannot believe those figures are reliable, and I should like to know where they were obtained.

Mrs. NORTON. I received these figures from the Department of Labor.

Mr. PEYSER. Under the provisions of the bill providing \$35 a month, is it not fair to assume that in many cases the person applying for help may receive \$5, \$10, or \$15 a month from a member of the family, so that the average expenditure may be less than even \$20 a month?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; every dollar contributed to the pensioner from any other source will be deducted from the \$35.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested in the age limit that has been placed in the bill. Can the gentlewoman from New

Jersey give the House any information why it was fixed at 65 years of age? In my State it has been fixed at 70.

Mrs. NORTON. The original bill called for 60, and it seemed to be considered that a person of 60 was just as needy, if destitute, as one older. Then we had some discussion to raise the age to 68, and we compromised on 65.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the age limit in the various States?

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman, I am sure, will admit that a person needy at 60 is in just as difficult a position as if he were older, and today, with prevailing conditions, it is difficult for any man or woman to secure a position when past 60 years of age.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentlewoman give the House any information as to what is the average age in the States that have adopted this kind of law?

Mrs. NORTON. I am not sure I have that information, but I think the average age is about 65. There are some States under, some States over this, but I believe from the evidence brought out in the committee that the average is about 65, and this is one of the reasons we arrived at this particular age.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If the gentlewoman from New Jersey will permit, I believe the average is about 63½ years, to be exact.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In my own State it happens to be 65.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN. I presume the gentlewoman knows there are about 28 States in the Union giving these old-age pensions?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I stated that at the beginning of my argument. There are 28 States with such legislation, and I think there are about 10 other States with pending legislation which they hope to complete within the next year or two.

Mr. HENNEY. Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. HENNEY. In regard to the State of Wisconsin, I may state that previously it has been optional with the counties as to whether they would take care of their aged people or not, but at a recent election the vote was 531,915 to 154,726 to make it compulsory on the State, and it is proposed to raise the money through a tax on incomes of over \$15,000 and also on labor-saving machinery.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I have here an editorial from one of the Washington papers which I should like to read into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post of Apr. 4, 1934]

THE MODERN WAY

Old-age pensions are no longer a novelty. Twenty-seven States are now caring for indigent aged people in their own homes. From experience over a considerable period they have found that old folks who are unable to support themselves can be saved from the humiliation of going to a poorhouse without any additional expense to taxpayers. The average cost of old-age pensions runs from about \$8 to \$24 per month, depending upon local conditions and the terms of various State laws. The average cost of maintaining a person in the District Infirmary at Blue Plains is \$22.50 per month, exclusive of interest on a large capital investment.

No one questions the need for some action to relieve aged indigents of Washington. Blue Plains is always overcrowded. The enactment of an old-age pension law appears to be the only alternative to the investment of more money in institutions of this kind. The principle that aged people without means of support must be assisted by the State is no longer open to question. The real issue is whether Congress shall adopt for the District the most modern as well as the most satisfactory system of discharging this inevitable obligation.

May I say in this connection that we have held hearings on this bill and it has received the unanimous support of all the associations of the District as being the very best way of taking care of the poor people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey if she does not believe that the passage of an old-age

pension bill for the people of the District of Columbia will advance the enactment of a national old-age pension law in this country?

Mrs. NORTON. I think so, but I do not know that that is important in the consideration of this measure. It would appear to be a matter for the States to decide, and I should like to see every State in the Union adopt its own old-age pension bill. I believe in State rights.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentlewoman from New Jersey will now yield, as I understand the figures she read a moment ago of the average rates in the 28 States that have old-age pension laws, they range from \$8 to \$24 a month?

Mrs. NORTON. That is about the average.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I ask why it is necessary to make it almost twice the average in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. NORTON. The people in the District seem to think this is a fair amount, and, after all, they should have something to say about spending their own funds.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All the States should have that right.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. BLACK rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New Jersey desire to yield the balance of her time?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that under the rules someone opposing the bill should now be recognized.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition first.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his motion?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not fair. The gentleman intends to try to close the debate. We must vote that motion down.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON and Mr. BLACK) there were—ayes 30, noes 47.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? It is of course permissible under the rules for the chairman of the committee, or anyone else, who has an hour, to yield a part of their time to others.

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather the gentleman would get his time in his own hour. If he is recognized he has an hour. I want to use all of my hour.

Mr. TABER. I wanted to ask the gentleman one question, and it is very important. I went to the desk and asked for a copy of the hearings on the bill and there are none. I was wondering whether the gentleman knew whether there were hearings on this important bill.

Mr. BLACK. That inquiry should be directed to the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the committee does not answer, I will state that I have not been able to locate any hearings, and I do not believe there are any hearings. Mr. Chairman, as long as I remain a Member of this House, whenever I think a piece of legislation is unwise you are going to find me here on this floor doing everything within the limits of parliamentary law to stop that legislation. I am going to do it whether the chairman of the committee is a man or a woman. I am going to do it whether the chairman likes it or not.

When anyone is elected to Congress he takes his seat in this House as a Member of the House to abide by the rules. The rules of this House permit every Member to use to the utmost all his skill, if he has any, to fight for legislation which he thinks ought to pass and to fight against legislation which he thinks ought not to be passed, and no

one has any right to become peeved when he opposes such a bill. You will find me opposing all bills that I deem bad as long as I am a Member, and nothing is going to stop me.

When we had a former District day there were about 15 or 20 bills on the calendar. This bill was up near the top. I went to the chairman of this committee, and I went to the chairman's straw boss, Mr. BLACK, and I also went to the assistant straw boss, Mr. PALMISANO, and told them all that if they called up this bill they would not pass many bills that day on the calendar, that I was against it, and that I was going to use every bit of parliamentary knowledge of the rules that I had to stop it. And after consultation they sidetracked this bill, and put it down at the bottom of the list, and I helped them to pass quite a number of noncontroversial measures that day. They knew then that I opposed this bill, and intended to do everything within my power to stop it.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, I cannot yield. I want to have the lady obey the rules as the men have to do. I cannot answer the lady like I could a man, and I do not want to be placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is reflecting on a Member of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not. I am simply protecting my own rights.

Mr. BLACK. I do not mind the gentleman calling me a straw boss.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman from New York has been very active in helping to guide District legislation through this House. The proponents of a measure should never become personally offended because other Members disagree with them, and see fit to oppose their measure. The District of Columbia Committee has always brought some bad legislation, once in a while, on the floor ever since I have been here. I see a former chairman of the District Committee now on the floor. I helped to kill scores of bad District bills when he was chairman of the committee every year during the time I served on this committee in the House. I helped to kill about half the bills he favorably reported.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Name him!

Mr. BLANTON. It was Fred Zihlman, who sits over there smiling. I know that it seems natural to my old chairman, Fred Zihlman, to see me on this floor vigorously fighting a District bill. For several years while he was chairman of the committee I was the ranking Democratic member, and we had it back and forth across the table.

Members here have already expressed their great surprise that respecting a bill of this importance the committee has furnished us no hearings whatever. And question after question was propounded in an attempt to obtain pertinent information, all to no avail. At least we should have been informed of the fact that the District Commissioners reported to the chairman of this committee that the District budget cannot possibly carry the financial load of supporting old-age pensions in the manner prescribed by this bill at this time. When the Commissioners said that, they in effect said that this bill should not be passed. If their District budget cannot possibly carry the financial load which the provisions of this bill places on them, then how is the financial load to be carried? Are we Congressmen to ignore their warning? They say they cannot carry the financial load of this bill. Are we going to put on them a load they cannot carry? Or is it expected that the Government will carry the load?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Something was said about somebody being afraid of votes at home. I made no such statement. I never have been afraid of votes back home since I have been a Member of this Congress. If this Congress is in session when my primary comes up you will find me still here very busy and working hard on this floor, 2,000 mile away.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I would prefer for the gentleman to use his own time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am going to use my own time. I have such confidence in the people I represent back home that I know that if I do my duty here on this floor and help to kill bad bills they are going to look after me when election time comes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute, then I will. I have confidence in my constituents, and they have confidence in me, and that is the reason they take care of me, whether I am there or not. They know that when I am here they can depend on me to fight to stop bad bills.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. It is about time the gentleman said something about the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and if I desired, I could omit it from my remarks. It so happens that under the rules I can use my time in discussing any subject that suits me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to let any of these "side swipers" on the side lines interject anything I do not like into my remarks.

Mr. BLACK. Why reduce me from a "straw boss" to a "side-swiper"?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, as the gentleman changes, I change. What he says here is futile when I have the floor, because I am going to use my hour in my own way. Do you know what the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] tried to do, Mr. Chairman, when they had had all of the time used in debate—this gentleman who talks about being fair? He knows that this is a very controversial measure, and I think that when the other gentleman over there from New York [Mr. TABER] in his own proper time moves to strike out the enacting clause, there will be enough votes here to strike it out. The gentleman knew that this is a controversial measure, and when his chairman had used all of the time in debate for the bill and there had been none against it, he made a motion for the committee to rise, so as to go into the House. He was then going to make a motion to close debate and keep the opposition from being heard at all. Oh, I am on to that, I will say to the great chief justice from New York.

Mr. BLACK. Chief justice? That is better. Now, I shall not make any points of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was interested in hearing the gentleman say that he did not feel worried about how his constituents in Texas felt.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, let us get away from that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman spent 2 weeks in his legislature when they were considering the redistricting bill when Congress was in session.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that is absolutely not true. I did not leave Washington and did not go near my Texas Legislature. Politicians down there gerrymandered my district and tried to frame me by stealing away 10 of my best counties. The gentleman does not know the facts but has been misinformed, and yet he is a pretty good scout at that. Somebody has misinformed him; and will not the gentleman take that back, since he has been misinformed?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I now want to talk about this bill. The very first paragraph in the bill provides that the three Commissioners shall constitute the Board. Suppose we should do away with the Engineer Commissioner. I am not going to vote to do it. I want to see Major Gotwals or somebody like Major Gotwals kept there. I am for Major Gotwals. I

believe in him and I believe he is honest, but there is a move here on both sides of the Capitol to do away with the Engineer Commissioner and have only two. Why don't you strike out the word "three" and leave it to the Commissioners if you want a good bill?

Mr. BLACK. We will accept that amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well, I shall offer an amendment to that effect. So gentlemen can see that I am helping the committee frame a good bill. Let us take the next paragraph, which gives those three Commissioners carte blanche authority to employ just as many employees as they want to. There is no limitation on it; they can appoint 500 if they want to; they can appoint 5,000 employees if they want to. There is no limitation.

I have been in this House long enough to know that it is advisable to put a limitation as to the number of employees on these bills, or you will have several times the proper number of appointments.

There is no limitation on salaries. The Commissioners can fix the salaries just like they want to by calling the positions certain designated names, and then under the act of 1923 the Classification Board fixes those salaries automatically, with certain sums for certain positions. It is the name of the position that fixes the salary.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I cannot. The lady can use her own time.

I do that because no matter what the lady says to me I have to smile and bear it, because I am a gentleman and I cannot talk back. I never say anything unkind to a lady. They can say anything they want to me, but I always smile. Unfortunately, sometimes, when we are fighting a bill that a lady wants we cannot yield to them. [Laughter.]

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I yield to my good friend, because I am her friend, and the gentlewoman knows it. I am going to try to kill her bill, but I shall be pleased to yield to her.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman knows that in the end he will probably vote for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Never will I vote for it until the gentlewoman puts in the bill all the people of the United States. Then I would vote for it. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON. This is a District bill. I have no authority to insert such a provision. Please do not designate me as "the lady." I am a Member of the House, with exactly the same credentials as the gentleman from Texas, and I want no concession because of my sex. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Then everything will be lovely, and all of us who do not believe that this is a wise measure to pass at this time may oppose it without fear of anyone taking offense. It would be an unthinkable situation if Members of Congress were denied the privilege of opposing measures they deemed unwise and unsalutary because they were afraid it might be considered discourtesy to a lady chairman in charge of some bill. I try to be courteous to everybody, but I reserve the right to oppose bad bills, to object to them [laughter], and fight them from the floor.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman evidently thinks that he is the only Member in this House who has the interest of the country at heart.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there are lots of others here. When the vote comes on the motion to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, it is going to be a surprise to my friend.

Mrs. NORTON. It may be a surprise to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me discuss this bill; then I will yield to my friend. I want to get the facts before the committee. Are you gentlemen in favor of letting three Commissioners select all the appointees they want and fix their salaries?

Mr. STUDLEY. Will their salaries be fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BLANTON. Their salaries will be fixed by designating them by names of jobs, calling them director of this or chief clerk of that, or assistant director or assistant chief clerk. That fixes the salary under the Classification Act, and they have found it out. I am not in favor of it.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BLANTON. Please let me proceed a little.

I am going to insist on Congress holding the purse strings. I am going to insist on this Congress saying how many employees shall be appointed and what their salaries shall be; and then you will not put a dreadful burden on my splendid friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], as head of the Appropriations Committee, to pass on these matters himself. You are placing a great burden on him to make him assume the responsibility to hold them in line. The Congress ought to hold them in line. And that is a vicious part of this bill. I will never vote for the bill as long as this matter is left indeterminate as to the number of employees and their salaries.

Now let me get to another point. Did you know that during this fiscal year, in addition to \$6,500,000 in cash that your taxpayers have given to this District for its running expenses, that the P.W.A. and the C.W.A. have given to the District of Columbia out of your tax money, out of the Treasury of the United States, \$9,000,000 more?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry. I know more about it than my friend from Maryland. I have been checking this up.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I cannot yield. I want to get these facts before the Committee. Now, that is what they got in the District. Do you know who got this relief money? I am told that the records show that about 91 percent of it has been received by the colored population of Washington. Now, if it were a legitimate population I would have no objection. I am one southern Congressman who has never had any prejudice against the colored race, when they conduct themselves properly. I am their friend. Why, DE PRIEST will come to me for a favor lots quicker than he will to some of his Republican colleagues over here. The colored men in this building know I am their friend, and they come to me when in trouble. Why, when our man Coates, back here in the cloakroom, had to have some money for an operation on his eye, did he go to WOODRUFF, McFADDEN, or SNELL? No; he came to me. [Laughter.] I let him have the money. He knew where he could get it. They know who are their real friends.

The colored people in all the States around here have found out that it is an easy thing for a colored man to live in Washington and they have been drifting in here for years, and lots of them are so no account you could not make them work if you used a long prod pole. Some will not work. They have been getting this relief here; 91 percent of all these millions we have spent here has gone to them; and your taxpayers back home are paying for it.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. I wonder if the people of Washington who are insisting upon so-called "local" self-government remember their experience of the years 1871 to 1874, when Congress yielded to their importunities and established a territorial form of government in the District of Columbia, and for 3 years the National Capital had one of the most corrupt governments ever maintained in the United States, so venal, extravagant, and wasteful that the people of the District came to Congress and begged it to abolish the territorial government and again take over the administration of District affairs.

Mr. BLACK. That was in a Republican year.

Mr. LOZIER. And during this period of self-rule, one Sheppard was the political boss of the District. His statue stands in front of the District Building. During this orgy of self-government he ruled the District and managed its affairs with unprecedented prodigality. Taxes were high, and the District became hopelessly insolvent.

Mr. BLANTON. And Congress came along and paid off all their debts and has been paying their debts ever since.

May I tell you how good newspapers misrepresent? The Washington Star is one of the most reliable newspapers in

the United States, except when it gets into a discussion of District matters and the Federal contribution. It is a little bit biased and prejudiced then. The other day I called attention to the fact that the Government had spent lots of money on various things here. For instance, I stated that our Government had spent lots of money on this million-dollar bridge on Connecticut Avenue, and on the \$2,000,000 Key Bridge. I did not say the Government paid all of it. Then I referred to this new Memorial Bridge that goes over to Arlington, and said the Government spent \$14,000,000 on that bridge and I said that it all came out of the Treasury, and it did.

The Star had a long statement in yesterday's paper to the effect that I had said the Government spent all of the money on all of these bridges. I did not say that. I referred to the Memorial Bridge. The Government did spend a great big sum on the million-dollar bridge on Connecticut Avenue, and on the \$2,000,000 Key Bridge, and on the bridge down next to the Southern Railroad, and they spent a large sum on every other bridge which has been built in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that the appropriation for the District of Columbia as fixed last year by the Congress was six and a half million dollars and that the Civil Works Administration and the Public Works Administrator came along and gave them more.

Mr. BLANTON. The P.W.A. and the C.W.A. have given the District \$9,000,000 this year.

Mr. MAY. Allotments have been made to a lot of these projects without Congress knowing anything about the matter and projects, too, are being withdrawn. I am wondering if they would not have the power to bring it back in here and give it to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. They may. You have to watch them. They are fixing to bring up a \$20,000,000 bill now. Secretary Ickes and these Commissioners had their pictures taken the other day, and they have arranged with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norron] to bring in a bill to permit the District of Columbia to borrow \$20,000,000 from the Public Works Administration. Are you going to vote for that bill? I am not. I do not propose to permit them to do that when this District is now out of debt, when the tax rate was reduced to \$1.50 per \$100 last year, and the taxable values were reduced \$80,000,000, with a rate of \$1.50 to cover all taxes. They have a \$5,000,000 surplus in their treasury this year. I do not intend to vote to permit the District to borrow a cent to be wasted down here in the Municipal Building. I know too much about this Municipal Building. I have been checking up on it for nearly 20 years, and I am not going to give them any leeway by my vote. I want you to help us kill this \$20,000,000 bill that they are fixing to bring in here.

Mr. BLACK. I wonder if the gentleman will say a few words about this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I know the gentleman does not like for me to tell you his plans; but we have to anticipate. The gentleman is a member of two of the worst committees that I ever saw—the Committee on Claims and the Committee on the District of Columbia—but he is a good fellow after all. Whenever we get tied up here and feel like the world is going backward and we want to relax, the only thing is to get him up on the floor for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman is quite a help himself.

Mr. BLANTON. May I say that this bill pays \$35 a month to every man and every wife over 65 years of age. You notice that it does not just pay this sum to a family. It provides for \$35 for the wife and \$35 for the husband. Most people who are 65 years old are married yet. Most of the spouses are about the same age. There is \$70 a month to be paid one family; \$14 is paid in New Jersey and \$24 is the highest average for the States, yet in the District of Columbia they are going to pay \$35 to each person, man and wife, totaling \$70 a month to the two of them. They

are going to let them own a \$3,000 piece of property for a residence and also nearly \$1,000 of personal property.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Under sections 2 and 3 the two spouses might have \$930 of property and still get \$70?

Mr. BLANTON. And they may also have a \$3,000 home and still get \$70 a month.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman understands that under the present poorhouse system they would get \$76 a month?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; not in any State. May I say that a committee, when they bring in a bill like this, ought to be able to tell us all about it. I was surprised at this committee. Question after question was asked to obtain some definite information and they could not tell you a thing except that this bill carries \$35 for each individual per month. They ought to know something about it. They ought to know all about this subject of old-age pensions in the various States.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. I have just asked for a copy of the hearings and I find there are no printed hearings on this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That was called to the attention of the committee a few moments ago by our friend from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RUFFIN and Mr. LEE of Missouri rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield first to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUFFIN. Would the gentleman mind referring to section 19 and telling me, if he can, the source from which the funds that are going to make up this relief fund will come?

Mr. BLANTON. All the tax money that comes from taxation on District property here goes into the Treasury to the credit of the District. Then it has a water fund which goes to its credit although the Government spent millions of dollars on that water system and the Government today owns the old, original water conduit itself, and paid for it, and yet the District gets the water. It has been getting so much from its water fund, that has gone into its general treasury this year, that the water rate has been cut another 25 percent so that now the ordinary family will only pay about \$6 a year per family for the finest water in the world. We do not get that back home for \$6 a year per family.

Then there is the gasoline tax. Tennessee has a 7-cent gasoline tax, while the District has only 2 cents; but that is another source of revenue that goes into the General Treasury to the credit of the District.

Then the Government came along last year and gave them \$6,500,000 cash in a lump sum, which went to their credit. Then the P.W.A. and the C.W.A., which is nothing in the world but the money of the taxpayers—your constituents and mine—they like to call it "P.W.A. money", but it is nothing in the world but Government money out of your Treasury—they gave them \$9,000,000, and it went into the Treasury to their credit. All this is to their credit in the Treasury, and they pay their obligations from it, but that does not keep your people back home from realizing that they will be paying part of this pension to the colored population of 150,000 that has drifted in here from every part of the globe.

Mr. RUFFIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. RUFFIN. Is the gentleman in position to answer the question of whether any part of this fund I have asked about will come from the citizens of the District directly?

Mr. BLANTON. It will be such part as comes out of that general fund in the Treasury, which comes from the sources I have mentioned, coupled with the \$6,500,000 we gave them and the \$9,000,000 the P.W.A. gave them. They have this money to draw on, and they will draw on it. That is the way the money comes.

Mr. RUFFIN. In other words, am I to understand that all of it will come from the Federal Government, directly or indirectly? Is that a fair inference to draw?

Mr. BLANTON. No; it is not. I tried to explain that their taxes on real and personal property is used also.

Mr. RUFFIN. I wish the gentleman would cover that, because that is something I have been trying to get information on.

Mr. BLANTON. The bill provides these pensions shall come out of District funds. They will take this out of the actual taxes here in the District, but then they will use the Government fund of \$6,500,000 which we gave them for something else. This is the way they will get around it. They will just beat the devil around the stump and shift it about. If you will get the hearings on the District appropriation bill, you will find where Chairman CANNON and myself made one department admit they had been taking money appropriated for maintenance and raising salaries during the past year.

Mr. LEE of Missouri. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LEE of Missouri. The gentleman from New York, who is a member of the committee, stated that this bill would mean a saving in that it costs more to feed them at the poor farm than the pensions would amount to. If it is true that this would cost over \$31 a month, then that is a dirty graft, because in my county we feed them for \$10 a month better than you can feed them in this town.

Mr. KELLER. What do you feed them?

Mr. LEE of Missouri. We fed them everything that is right, and we do not ask the Congress to pay for them, either. We pay them ourselves in our State.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to one of the champions of the bill.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I do not know about that. I want the District to pay for this, but I want to ask the gentleman a question. If I remember correctly, the gentleman advocated a reduction of the tax rate from \$1.50 to \$1.20. If we had left it at \$1.50, we could have had the local people paying more taxes. I want to raise their tax rate and employ it for such purposes and take it off of the country as a whole and let the District support itself.

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer that statement. I have found out that money is wasted down here in this Municipal Building. If they have a surplus of money they waste it extravagantly, and when I found out that if you kept the tax rate at \$1.50 they were going to have a surplus of about \$6,500,000 to draw on, whenever they wanted it, for this or that, I decided it was best to earmark it and give the people of the District the benefit in a reduction of taxes. That is the reason we tried to provide for that rate, and I may tell you this. It is the most remarkable phenomenon in the world that you find the District papers here fighting a reduction of taxes.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Of course, that covers a lot of territory.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe that the people I know here and the people that my friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] knows in Washington, the real taxpayers, 99 percent of them, were in favor of this reduction in the tax rate and a saving of their money, but the newspapers caused this 30-cent tax raise to be put on the people here. The newspapers did this, coupled with the help of the Commissioners.

If you will get the hearings, you will find that the first question I asked was if they were going to oppose a reduction of taxes. I said, "Mr. Commissioner, are the papers correct yesterday and today in saying that you are not going to stand for reduction of taxes? How about that?" I asked the auditor if he had given out any such statement. They reluctantly denied it, but you could see that they were against reducing taxes, and they came in here and caused it to be stricken out.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Will the gentleman yield? They cannot operate the city in a proper way—the schools are among the worst that I ever saw.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield for that.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I know more about this than the gentleman. The fact is you have the finest school system here in the whole world.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not talking to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not have to talk to the bill. This is general debate. I can discuss any question from Maryland to Mesopotamia. [Laughter.]

Now, I am going to tell you about the schools. They have the finest school system in Washington there is in the world. They pay the highest salaries of any school system in the United States. They have the finest buildings; they have the finest playgrounds; they have the finest equipment. They teach the boys every kind of industrial work so that they can do something when they get out in the world. They have the finest cooking schools for girls, and they teach them sewing; they give them every kind of industrial instruction, and there has not been a single day in Washington during the depression that any teacher has had to wait 5 minutes for their money. They have it paid to them on time. When in Chicago their teachers have not been paid for 3 solid years, the teachers of Washington got it right on time.

Another thing—they have free schoolbooks here; some schools furnish lunches to them. I want to say that all this poppycock you hear about the schools not being good is pure rot, pure and simple rot.

They have the best teachers in the world, and one of the finest superintendents in the United States, Dr. Ballou, who gives the schools everything on God's earth that they can think of, and yet they are always complaining and coming to some Congressman, dissatisfied about something and making complaints, and having the Congressman get up and say that the school system is not what it ought to be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield? Is it not true that under the bill a husband and wife can get \$640 annually and in addition burial expenses and doctor's bills?

Mr. BLANTON. And can be the owner of a \$3,000 home and drawing \$70 a month between them.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; I cannot yield. I am for old-age pensions. I should like to see the people of my State some of these days, when other States and the Government can do it, be provided for in their old age. But I do not want them taxed to help put \$5,700,000 in the Treasury in a lump sum and then have the P.W.A. and the C.W.A. put \$9,000,000 more into the Treasury to pay old-age pensions in Washington while my State is without it. Whenever you get to voting the Federal Government into an old-age pension law, let it be a general law; a law that applies to all of the 48 States in the Union; and then you will find me supporting and fighting for it on this floor.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield to my delightful colleague from Pennsylvania, who is one of the great proponents of this bill.

Mr. DUNN. I thank the gentleman. Can the gentleman tell me of any more economical way to provide relief than by the old-age pension system?

Mr. BLANTON. This District has taken care of its indigent people for many years, and there are fewer indigent people in Washington than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. BLACK. Then how is the bill going to be so expensive?

Mr. BLANTON. But because there are a few shacks in some alleys here—and have you not got them in all of your cities and towns—a great hullabaloo is raised. Have you not got them down on the Mississippi Delta, shacks that people live in? Oh, these Washington papers do not want any shacks in Washington at all. They want every colored sniper that slips in here from some farm to get an easy living, to live in a three-story house with basement, and they want to have the living provided for him, with two or three servants and a cook and washerwoman also.

Mr. STRONG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who has had many years of experience along these lines.

Mr. STRONG of Texas. Does the gentleman not know that there will soon be before the House a national old-age pension bill?

Mr. BLANTON. We have a committee studying that subject now.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry that I cannot.

Mrs. NORTON. Will not the gentleman please yield for a question? I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, if you put it that way.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman believe in State rights?

Mr. BLANTON. I used to, but I have been voting for so many things in this Congress that I have been taught against ever since my childhood that I have gotten all mixed up.

Mrs. NORTON. If the gentleman believes in State rights, there is nothing in the world to prevent his going back to Texas and seeing to it that his State passes a law taking care of the poor people there. I shall be glad to aid him in doing so.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that when normalcy gets back, and when this depression is over, you will find the gentleman from Texas on this floor fighting against every kind of measure he thinks is unsound.

Mrs. NORTON. That is not answering my question.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry. I want to use the remainder of my time. The gentleman can get his own time.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. I do not know whether the gentleman understood my question; but if he did, I did not hear his answer.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought I had answered the question, but I shall answer it now. I know what the question is.

Mr. DUNN. Does the gentleman know of any more economical way to provide relief for the aged than through an old-age pension system?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. If you will inquire up in New Jersey, you will find out that the pensioners there under the old-age pension law are three times in number what they thought they would be when they passed the law. If you will check it up in California, you will find that they are paying three times as many as they expected to when they passed the law; and if you check it up in every other State, you will find the same thing. When you once pass a law that gives people easy money, you will find a lot of them coming in that ought not to come in. You will find a lot of them who are willing to live on the State and the Government and get something for nothing.

Mr. DUNN. Does not the gentleman believe it will cost a great deal more to construct and maintain poorhouses than to come to an old-age pension law?

Mr. BLANTON. We have been carrying on poorhouses for a long time, and I think we will do it much more easily in the future. But of course, we do not want to force indigent people to go to the poorhouse if we can help it. I am in favor of the principle. If the President right now would say to us that his financial policy would permit it, if he would say that it would not disrupt his policy, I would vote right now for a national old-age pension law that would take care of every person 70 years old in the United States, but the age ought to be 70 years.

Oh, they talk about 60 and 65. Why, most of the most valuable men and women in the Nation are 65 years old.

Mr. MEAD. Sam Insull is about 75, is he not?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; Insull has stolen more money from the American people than any other grafter, and he is 75

right now, and we are having a terrible time catching him and bringing him back here. We have citizens over all the United States 75 and 85 years of age, men who are doing service to their country and to their State. We have them in this House. I saw Uncle Joe Cannon when he was 85 years old do some of the best service ever performed on the floor of the House.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Then we have that Turk, who is 116 years old, still doing good service.

Mr. BLANTON. And we have a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk out here, Mr. Andy Smith, who has been holding that job down with this Government for 55 years, and there is not a more capable man in the Capitol.

I hope that he will be here for 20 more years. Why, take Tyler Page, one of the leading men of this country, the author of the American's Creed, one of the brightest men in the Nation, has served this Government here for 50 years; and I will guarantee he will be with you Republicans for many more years [laughter]; and if you ever should get back into power about the only thing that will recompense us Democrats is that we will have him again for Clerk of the House.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman has cited the cases of Capitol employees, but under existing law it is the policy of the Civil Service Commission to retire people from service after they have given a lifetime in the service. The Civil Service Commission demands that at a certain age they retire. We have those people to deal with and to provide for.

Mr. BLANTON. I am one of those who believe that if Congressmen were allowed to make a few selections of the employees in their districts [laughter and applause] they would pick lots better ones because they would know them and would be responsible for them.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman has made the statement that he favors a national policy of old-age pensions rather than the policy of local administration?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, I do; I will vote for a national policy.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to have the gentleman develop this thought: The gentleman also brought out the fact that under local administration there are conflicting delegations of power and authority, and there are many rates in conflict one with the other; the rates are high in some places and low in others; is it the thought of the gentleman from Texas that a centralized administration of a national law would be so far removed from local politics that it would be better administered and more uniform in its application throughout the country?

Mr. BLANTON. Why, certainly. It would cost the taxpayers of the Nation much less money; and my friend knows that it could be regulated better as a national law and there would be more justice in its administration than if it were left to the States, because there are 48 Governors and 48 State administrations to administer local laws, and they would not be administered in the same way. We should have one system centralized in Washington. When our committee gets through with its study and investigation of the national old-age pension system you will find me on this floor fighting for such a law.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. ELTSE of California. To come back to the bill, may I ask this question: Under section 6 (a) and (b) will not shiftlessness increase? I should like to have the gentleman's reaction to that.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is self-evident. If the gentleman will check up on the relief that has been going on in the District and check up the opportunities that recipients of the relief have had for getting work, of which they have

not taken advantage, he will see there is lots of shiftlessness.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Will there not also be a tendency for them to skin out their property under this law?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; and we will see property values go down. A house that has been worth \$6,000 or \$7,000 will be reduced overnight to \$3,000.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Just this one question and I shall be through. With regard to national rather than local administration, does not the gentleman believe it would be helpful for the country if we made of this bill a model for the District of Columbia that would be copied by the States and would eventually become the national law?

Mr. BLANTON. I may say to the gentleman from New York that there is not a single paragraph in this bill that is a model, with all due respect and regard to the committee. It has been drawn for them by somebody else; I am not reflecting upon them. I do not believe it is a model. To pass this bill would be to pass the wrong kind of bill for the States to adopt. It is my belief that the committee now studying the question from the national viewpoint will bring in a much better bill.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I understood the gentleman to say that he preferred a national law to a State law?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to a booklet that we ought to pay more attention to on this side of the aisle—the Democratic platform of 1932.

It says:

We advocate unemployment and old-age pension under State laws.

That is what we are doing right now in working out a bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The gentleman knows that I favor a national old-age pension law, and that I am the author of a resolution under which a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor is investigating this subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask the gentleman this question: He got his idea from foreign countries?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman brought that over here from a foreign country?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I may say to the gentleman—

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman bring that over from a foreign country?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. No. I will answer the gentleman's question if he will give me an opportunity. I believe that the number of old people in the country is increasing. According to the figures available, and they are available to everyone, not only the total number of old people is increasing in the United States but also the proportion of older people to the rest of the population. I am in accord with the gentleman, and I believe in the end it will be too expensive for the old-age pensions to be paid out of the Public Treasury; therefore, I believe in a contributory system on a national basis, and I believe the gentleman has a somewhat similar idea, but in the meantime we should pass this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I will not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. TRUAX. I think the gentleman from Texas is sincerely in favor of a national old-age pension law when it can be applied universally and there is a means to finance the proposition. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Treasury cannot stand it, and I am not for the contributory system. I say it should come from the wealthy of the country and from the public utilities.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, while there was not much logic and there was not much social philosophy indulged in this afternoon, there were plenty of errors made as to what this bill is really intended to do. A great many medieval social suggestions have been made on the floor. The bill itself is to take care of the aged in the homes, if possible, instead of sending them to a poorhouse, the poorhouse system being more expensive to the taxpayers than the other and more modern system. That is all there is to this proposition.

It is true, probably, that the national old-age pension bill should have come before this one as far as some Members are concerned, but it is no fault of the aged of the District and it is no fault of the taxpayers of the District that they have to get their legislation from the Congress and that Congressmen come from States which have no old-age pension systems. However, the fact that Texas does not have an old-age-pension system should not keep the Congress, because it has Congressmen from the State of Texas, from legislating along advanced sociological lines for the good of the District of Columbia. The people of the District of Columbia have by force of law to depend on Congress. They would probably rather not do this, but that is the situation they find themselves in at this time. It is to be regretted that all the States of the Union have not an old-age-pension system, but 22 out of the 48 States have this modern method of taking care of their aged.

I was astonished to hear one gentleman here in an off-handed way—and I am sure if his remarks were carried back to his district, he would be defeated—state, "Oh, we feed them for \$10." Imagine that statement on the floor of this Congress in this day and generation. As a matter of fact, it is costing the District of Columbia and the Federal Government as their contribution toward the District finances \$38 a month for each inmate in the poorhouse. This system will cost about \$20 a month, and instead of ultimately being a great charge on the taxpayers of the country and the taxpayers of the District there will be a saving by this bill.

There is another situation in connection with this bill, and that is that an old, indigent couple in the District under the system now prevailing cannot live out their old age together. They must be separated and put into separate institutions. Under this bill, if indigent, they will be allowed to live together during their declining years.

Of course you can use your imagination about any piece of legislation. You can see ghosts in any bill. You can say that any bill will be crookedly worked, and that any bill will not properly work; but this bill, with proper and decent administration, will work out the way it is intended to work out. We have no right to assume that a piece of legislation passed by the Congress will be improperly administered. The proper assumption to make is that any bill passed by the Congress will be prudently and efficiently taken care of in its administration.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLACK. Surely.

Mr. SNELL. I am not opposed to the system of old-age pensions; but as I look through the bill, it is much more generous than the one we have in our State, and it seems to me it would be pretty expensive to start it at 60 years of age. Does not the gentleman think that is rather young?

Mr. BLACK. No; and I will tell the gentleman why I do not think so. Insurance companies have reported, after a conference, that 84 percent of people over 60 years of age are in need of support by somebody other than themselves.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] mentioned 60 years of age.

Mr. BLACK. My bill was 60, but the committee amended it to start at 65 years of age. There are other things to be taken into consideration, such as the conditions surrounding them and the ability of their relatives to support them, and all these things will be investigated. Everybody over 65 is not going to get \$35 a month under this bill. This is not the thought of anybody. It is highly unfair to take what

might be possible under the most extravagant and imprudent system of administration and charge that up to a bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is a filibuster going on—

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for just one more question?

Mr. BLACK. Surely; I am always pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Under the provisions of the law in our State, if a person applies for such a pension and has any property, he must turn it over to the county.

Mr. BLACK. There is a provision in this bill that such property ultimately will be turned over to District aid.

Mr. SNELL. That is after they die.

Mr. BLACK. After they die, but the fact they hold property is taken into consideration in the administration of the act.

Mr. SNELL. The experience has been in our State that there are a great many people who apply for an old-age pension and when they find they must give up their own property they are not willing to do this but go on and support themselves and I think this is a pretty good provision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I did not care to take the floor at this time, but in view of the fact that the gentleman from Texas, the watchdog of the Treasury, has constantly refused to yield to me, I thought it would be more appropriate that I should at least take 5 minutes.

The excuse of the gentleman from Texas for not yielding to any Member of the House at the beginning was his suggestion that every member of the committee may have an hour to discuss this bill. This means 435 hours to kill time, as he stated, at the expense of the people of the country. This would mean a whole session. We have not an hour each allotted to us during the entire session of the Congress, and why the gentleman from Texas, with the experience he has had as watchdog of the Treasury should suggest a ridiculous proposition of this kind I cannot understand.

Furthermore, if there is objection to this bill, if there is a clause or paragraph in the bill that is not right, the bill has been before the House for some time, and the gentleman from Texas or any other Member of the House has the right to prepare such an amendment; but let us get down to the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. If he wants to strike anything out entirely or to correct any matter in the bill, that is another matter.

Oh, the gentleman says that the Federal Government is going to pay for this. I agree with the gentleman in that I do not want the Federal Government to pay a cent toward this pension, and I say that on the same principle the Government has no right to be matching its funds for State functions. I say let us go right down to the root of the whole matter and cut out all Government allotments, and let us tax the people solely for Government functions and not for State propositions, and this would include State roads, schools, and everything else.

The gentleman referred to the fact they are going to strike out the enacting clause. Of course, they are going to move to strike out the enacting clause, if the gentleman has his way, and this means that the gentleman is against old-age pensions, because if he were not against old-age pensions, notwithstanding what he may say about being in favor of them in some form or other, striking out the enacting clause would demonstrate to the Members of this House that he is utterly opposed to them.

So far as I am concerned, I was opposed to this bill originally, not because I did not believe in the principle of the bill, but because I did not want anyone from the Virginia line or the Maryland line to come here and make the people of the District pay them a pension. I want the District people to take care of their own people instead of putting them in the poorhouse.

Now, with all due respect to the Members here, anyone who would suggest that every Member of this House should

take an hour and kill time, if you please, at the expense of the Government—

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think that somebody on the committee ought to take the floor and explain what this bill does before the House is asked to consider it? No such explanation has been made.

Mr. PALMISANO. We were trying to explain the bill, but the gentleman from New York, as well as the gentleman from Texas, has taken the position that he is going to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. TABER. I have not taken any such position, and I refuse to permit the gentleman to say that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition against the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill for old-age pensions in the District of Columbia, because I think it is a just bill. I am especially for it because Congress has the entire right to legislate on this matter in this District. I am for it because if it is passed, an old-age pension law in the District of Columbia will be a guide to us when we come to pass a Nation-wide old-age pension law, which we are certainly going to do. It is for these reasons that I am for the bill. Whether minor changes should be made in it is another matter.

I want to call your attention to these simple facts: Every poorhouse in the United States is a disgrace to our intelligence, to our courage, and to our national spirit. We ought to wipe it out, and we ought to wipe it out by providing something better than it is.

The United States is the only civilized country in the world that has not already recognized nationally the duty of providing old-age pensions. Every other civilized country in the world has done it, and why should we stand here quibbling over whether it should be \$35, \$32, or some other amount per month? We ought to open our eyes to these facts.

The time was when our fathers and mothers could save something and provide something for old age, but conditions were not what they are now. Those conditions have changed beyond the possibility of solution so far as individuals are concerned. Time was when if a man, or a woman, lost his job he could go West, take up land, and grow up with the country. It was an easy matter to take up land back in those days.

There is no land now in the West to take up. Today when a man loses his job he is out. He cannot go anywhere else and take up land, or get another job if he is past 40.

It is true here in the District now. Here is where we ought to provide the first pension law, because it will give us something of an experience in our National Government that will be a guide to us hereafter when legislation is undertaken to give Nation-wide old-age pensions.

Industry is no longer confined to localities, States, or regions. It is purely and simply national in its scope; and if we would get the proper vision, we must recognize it nationally.

Granting old-age pension is not charity—it is a just reward to the man or the woman who has served in industry up to the time he can no longer serve because of age. The mother who has struggled out on the farm or in the home of the factory town, in the great cities, or the villages until she is 65 ought to have a pension if she needs it, because every day of her life she served her country as much as any man or woman can serve it anywhere in any way. The men who have produced the wealth of the country by their labor, whether in field or factory, in mines, or over the whirling wheels of transport, wherever you go, in whatever industry, have earned enough more than they have received to assure them a pension as a reward for their service, if they need it. There are about 500,000 men and women over 65 who would be eligible for old-age pensions under the average conditions

recognized by the State laws already granting old-age pensions. If we grant old-age pensions, it would cost about \$172,000,000 a year, which would save a tremendous amount of money over the poorhouses and other systems of caring for our old people at present in use, quite outside of the rights of humanity.

Mr. Chairman, the property taxes in our States cannot stand the necessary burden to carry old-age pensions. Let us not deceive ourselves by thinking that they can. I was brought up as a strict State rights man, but I have sense enough to know that even the great State of Illinois cannot carry its part of the burden as it should be done. This burden of old-age pensions does not belong to the States. It belongs to industry as a whole, and ought not to be placed anywhere else. Industry, properly carried on, is abundantly able to carry old-age pensions, as it does in every other civilized country. We ought not to deceive ourselves; we ought to open our eyes to the plain facts in the case and see that it is good economy as well as good humanity. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it not a fact that every old person who has been a good citizen of this country, whether or not he has accumulated enough for himself in his old age, has all during his life contributed to the economic welfare of this country?

Mr. KELLER. I answer, "Yes, certainly", to that splendid question. I am glad the gentleman asked it. I endorse every word it implies.

Having been granted the right to revise and extend my remarks, I embrace the opportunity to quote the statements made in justification of my own national old-age pension bill introduced in the Seventy-second Congress and reintroduced in the Seventy-third Congress as H.R. 1623, and which is under consideration by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Labor. These statements are a part of the bill itself:

Modern industrial conditions have made old age a definite economic hazard. Specialized and standardized production has eliminated most of the need for skill and experience. The swifter pace required in modern industry produces greater nervous strain and tends to wear out workmen more rapidly than ever before. Many employers of labor, not being legally bound for the protection of their workers, feel no obligation for their support in old age.

American industry and commerce today are no longer confined to one locality, one State, or one region. Mergers and trusts have extended our major industries all over the Nation. Workers also move freely from one State to another and from one occupation to another. The problems which arise out of our industrial development are, therefore, no longer local or State-wide but National in scope. The questions of wages, hours of labor, employment and unemployment are questions for the Nation as a whole to solve rather than for each community or State. No one State can advance to a solution of these problems alone for fear of competition from neighboring States without such protection for their workers. This is best illustrated by the plethora of legislation now pending in Congress on these various subjects.

Old-age dependency is obviously a national problem, to be solved only by national or congressional action. State solutions of this problem, as of any other industrial problem, only aggravate the conditions in each particular State and leave a great portion of the problem unsolved.

The national character of old-age dependency has now been recognized by all industrial countries of the world except the United States. Everywhere else it is acknowledged that the honest and industrious workman or farmer who by industry and labor has added to the wealth of the Nation is entitled to humane consideration when, through no fault of his own, he is deprived of his earning power. He must not be made an object of charity, which serves only to embitter his declining years when his only crime is age and poverty. Industry has failed to deal with the question successfully. It is too directly interested in profits to consider men as they should be considered. Only the Nation acting as a whole can do this.

The maintenance of old men and women in their own homes on the basis of a self-respecting reward for their services has everywhere been found to be not only humane and honorable but also more economical than any other method of providing for them. This has been the case abroad and is also the experience of the 17 States which have already placed old-age security laws on their statute books. The average cost of a pension in California is \$23.10 per month as against a cost of \$44.74 in an almshouse. In New York the average pension amounts to only \$26.30 per month as against \$39.61 for almshouse maintenance.

It is estimated that within the United States there are about 500,000 men and women 65 years of age and over who are entitled to old-age relief as provided under the existing State laws. Less

than one fifth that number, however, are now in receipt of this security. Many of our States are unable to raise their taxes and therefore cannot follow the lead of the 17 States now having more or less limited old-age pension laws. It is indeed a question whether even these wealthier States can continue these pensions, because the real-estate taxes are consuming the property. But if this burden were distributed equally over all industry it would relieve this menace to property and be easily borne by industry.

Since the problem of old-age dependency is essentially a national problem, it is obviously the duty of Congress to make such humane provisions for the aged citizens of America as they are justly entitled to.

It is in view of our national obligation to the aged who are least able to help themselves in these hard times that the following bill is presented.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEIDEMAN].

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague from Texas, [Mr. BLANTON] is diligent in obstructing matters that he thinks bad, and in pushing matters that he thinks will do good, I want to inform him that there is another petition on the Speaker's desk to bring out the McLeod bill from the Committee on Rules and I want to put that in the RECORD here so that everybody is charged with that knowledge. All we want is a vote on that bill. If you vote it down, we shall be satisfied, but we want a day in court on this bill just like any other bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman from Michigan think that the Rules Committee, both the majority and the minority members, were entitled at least to have a request made by those in favor of the McLeod bill for a hearing on that rule before the motion was filed to discharge?

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Normally, yes; except that at 4 minutes after 12 today a report was filed by the Banking and Currency Committee on this bill. If they wanted a vote on the McLeod bill, as amended, all the gentlemen needed have done who supported it was not to have filed a report, and we would have had the bill up today. We do not care whether it is the McLeod bill that passes or a good Democratic bill. All we want is the principle of this legislation voted on, and inasmuch as we are in parliamentary procedure, and as my friend from Texas says, it is just give and take, I want to say that I respect the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and think he is the greatest leader on this side of the House. I have gone with him many times, and I shall go with him again, but on this matter I just cannot follow him, and in the future, on other issues, we are going to be fighting side by side.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not want to get into any controversy with the gentleman, but in all candor it does seem to me that where a committee is charged with the responsibility of acting on matters of this sort, in good courtesy to that committee and to the precedents, it was at least entitled to have an opportunity to hear the resolution presented before you filed a motion to discharge.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Normally I would agree with that, but these are days of emergency, just as when my good friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] filed the bonus petition, and in these emergency matters we have to be diligent. To be of any value to the country this bill must be passed at this session.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. I think no one in this House has greater respect than I for the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, but I think the gentleman from Michigan takes the same position that I do, namely, that when 145 Members walk up to the desk and sign a petition to discharge a committee from further consideration of a bill, they are entitled to a prompt vote on that measure, just as we secured a prompt vote on the Patman bonus bill, and that we should vote it up or down.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I agree with the gentleman, and I refuse to yield further. In other words, 145 Members of this House want to do just what 1 Senator can do on the other side of the Capitol, and that must be music to the

ears of my friend from Texas. We fought side by side in favor of another bill, and he said at that time that all we wanted was to give 145 Members of this House the same right that 1 Member of the other body had.

Mr. BLANTON. I think our good friend from Michigan is one of the most promising Members of the House. I admire all his splendid work he has done here, and I am his good friend, even when he is against me, and I think he is doing good work now, for he is doing his very best. But he did not answer the question my friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], Chairman of the Committee on Rules asked him. That was a proper question, and that committee is a responsible committee of the House, and should have been shown some consideration.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I came just about as close to answering it as my good friend from Texas did to answering the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] as to how you are going to improve on the old-age pension proposition, so that we are about even there.

Now I want to divert and talk about the school system in the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said that he has watched these schools for 20 years, and they are among the best in the country. The gentleman's line of travel must have been over one line, Abilene to Washington and back again. I would like to have my friend go to the city of Detroit and see what a real clean school is and what a real playground is. The trouble is that he has seen that same school in the District for 20 years, and if he had traveled the route for 30 years he would still see the same school, because in 1908 a commission was appointed by this House and condemned many buildings still in use. One school which they had been using for 50 years in this District was condemned in 1908, but it is still being used.

We must help the schools. The Jefferson School in southwest Washington is only 50 feet from a railroad where trains are switched day in and day out, hour in and hour out; and the children cannot study on account of the noise. If you go up into the auditorium on the third floor of that school building, every time you take a step the floor bends under your weight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan to resume our colloquy. He is under the impression I have never been to Detroit, when as a matter of fact I have visited there several times.

In 1907, in company with 168 Texans, I spent quite a nice sojourn in Detroit. Our party was royally entertained by the Detroiters, and we were shown everything you had, from your fine aquarium to your schools; and we were carried up to Marblehead on a fine boat, with an orchestra and dancing; and, oh, we were most royally entertained.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. The gentleman did not sample all the wines they had at Marblehead, I hope.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we had a good time, and picnicked all day at Marblehead. And I still think that our Washington schools, as a whole, are the finest in the United States.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. To complete my time, I am intensely interested in the schools in the District. I am not finding fault with the teachers; they are fine teachers and are doing the best they can. I do not find fault with the administration—and I have no patronage in the District; there is not a thing they can take away from me and there is not a thing they can give to me. I am fighting for the interest of the children. I want to see clean rooms for the little children to go to, and clean playgrounds for them to get their recreation in.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. Is that motion in order unless the gentleman withholds his point of order that there is not a quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to rise is a preferential motion and is always in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4548) to provide old-age securities for persons over 60 years of age residing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES OF FRAUD AGAINST WAGE EARNERS EMPLOYED OF FEDERAL BUILDING PROJECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I offered a resolution calling for an investigation into charges of fraud against wage earners employed on Federal building projects in the District of Columbia.

Since publication in the Washington Herald of the first charges of improper handling of pay rolls, I have been visited by many workers and have received letters from others, all indicating a sickening condition of coercion and extortion among the building-trades craftsmen employed on Government work. While my first information concerned only conditions in the District of Columbia, evidence brought to me since Friday indicates that these abuses are national in scope.

In appropriating the vast sums now being expended in public-works construction it was the clearly expressed intention of the Congress and the Executive that these undertakings were primarily designed to relieve unemployment and to restore in some measure the purchasing power of American labor. I do not think that many of us were in real opposition to such a worthy objective.

In awarding contracts for the construction of those buildings it was very definitely specified by both Congress and the Executive that the prevailing rate of wages in each community should be paid on Government work. The Bacon-Davis Act, which became a law at that time, was most explicit on this point.

When contracts were awarded costs were figured on the prevailing rates of wages and the contractors handling these projects are today collecting from the Treasury the money to pay such wages—but the prevailing rate of wages is not being paid in Washington. The contractors receive the money to pay them from the Treasury, but the employees do not get that money from the contractors.

The difference, Mr. Speaker, is going into pockets where it does not legally or morally belong. To speak with reserve, Mr. Speaker, that is graft. To give it its right name, it is theft—theft from workingmen who dare not protest lest their wives and children be again forced to sit down at bare tables, shiver in cold rooms, or walk abroad in rags and broken shoes. The Government building program was and is a splendid gesture in the fight against that sudden poverty which has conquered America. It was and is an honest gesture on the part of Congress and the part of the Executive. It was no part of our plan that thieves should enter the house and steal the benefits from those for whom we intended them—but the thieves are here and we must put them out. I for one have little stomach for years of taxation to pay off the great increase of our public debt, if the money so borrowed is to be spent to fatten the strange sort of people who can steal from hungry men.

In the last few days I have seen evidence of things that I never imagined could happen. I have seen letters between

contractors, speaking frankly and in detail of contributions to a slush fund raised for the purpose of squeezing Washington labor for the benefit of the contractors and their associates—not squeezing them, mind you, to reduce costs to the Government but squeezing them to increase profits for the contractors beyond the fair and legitimate profit allowed in the contracts signed by the Government.

These contracts were awarded in competitive bidding. One of the conditions of every bid was that the prevailing rate of wages should be paid. Every bid included funds to pay those wages; in awarding contracts the Government is paying for the prevailing rate of wages; but, I repeat, the employees are not getting the money that is intended for them.

Nor is this all. Not only are the prevailing rates of wages being ignored in public work here and elsewhere in the United States but employees drawing the reduced rates cannot even collect those reduced wages. Men working for subcontractors receive checks which are refused by the banks upon which they are drawn. Employees in desperate need have been prevailed upon by their employers to turn those checks back for small amounts of cash, the balance being paid in earnings certificates, which have proven to be entirely worthless. If they complain, they are discharged; not only discharged but they cannot secure similar employment on other Government projects in Washington. I know that the blacklist is illegal, but that is what is being done.

I have a verified statement from one carpenter who received alleged pay checks to the total amount of \$333.42. On these checks the contractor paid him only \$49.37 in cash, the balance of \$284.05 being given in these fictitious earnings certificates. I have a photo of one of these earnings certificates here in my hand as I speak.

Now, this is not the charge of a disgruntled workman, nor is it an error in accounting, nor can it be questioned upon any other ground. When evidence of this transaction was presented to the Treasury of the United States, that Department forced the general contractor, under whom this subcontractor was working, to pay this man in full to the amount I have just recited. Not only was this man paid what was due him, but so were others who collectively received some \$15,000 in restitution for their losses in this swindle.

Thousands of other men did not dare protest for fear that they would lose even the weekly pittance that they were receiving for their work. If they dared to object they were told, "You want your job, don't you? Then keep your damned mouth shut!"

When the Treasury forced those refunds, they convicted the contractors of guilt. When that tiny restitution was made it was evidence that far more restitution remained to be made. Mr. Speaker, that restitution still remains to be made.

I do not indict all contractors on Government work. I recite a condition which calls for a full investigation, in which the innocent can have a fair opportunity to clear themselves and in which the guilty can be convicted. I hope that most contractors are innocent. I sincerely hope that because of my own self-respect as a member of the human race. I hate to think that many creatures bearing the form of manhood can do the things that have been done in this terrible business.

I have been told of workmen being herded into a shanty in groups of a dozen or more on pay day, where a foreman dealt cards around the table and each worker laid down \$15 as his stake in the supposed card game. Without even turning up the cards, the foreman would announce that the workmen had lost their money and they were hustled out to make room for another dozen victims of their employers' rapacity. In the perverted minds of these grafters, to be able to say that the men had lost their money gambling, gave some color of legality to the extortion of \$15 per week from each man as the price of his job.

On one contract in Washington, I am told that bricklayers were hired by the wife of the superintendent of the job. This contract was on Army property and an Army

officer was designated to inspect each pay envelop as the bearer of it left the grounds, to be sure that these envelops contained the full pay to which they were entitled. Evidently the Army had reason for suspicion. The envelops contained the proper amounts, but after they had been inspected, I am told, each workman had to meet this woman extortionist and pay her \$4 out of his envelop for each day for which he had been paid. The penalty for failure to comply with this demand for \$20 of graft money every week was immediate discharge and this other procedure which has seemingly succeeded the now illegal blacklist.

I could continue these stories for hours, but I have said enough to make plain the tenor of what has been told to me. This condition is a wanton insult to the President and to Congress. It is a revelation of cynical disregard for the decency which is supposed to characterize the human race. It is a cold-blooded overturning of our motives, of our efforts, and of the people's hopes for a return of reasonable prosperity. If recovery is to be bled at every step by these leeches she will never be able to complete the journey we are all hoping she will be able to make.

Men who do things like this are public enemies. We cannot deal with them, because there is no common ground upon which our minds can meet. All that we can do is to investigate them, identify them, and turn them over to the law to punish.

This is a question above partisanship. No question of politics enters into it. It is one absolutely necessary proceeding into which men of all parties can enter without jealousy or self-seeking.

Mr. Speaker, this investigation must be made. If it be thought necessary to have any number of these workmen appear before the Rules Committee, that can easily be arranged. The Rules Committee can also have such written and photographed evidence as it desires to establish the fact that these conditions do exist.

If it be desired to conduct this investigation under some other resolution than mine, I have no pride of authorship. This investigation must be made, and I urge upon you that we do not permit any unnecessary delay. This horrible state of affairs is undermining the confidence of the whole working class in the good faith of government. We owe it to ourselves as well as to the Nation to show that nothing like this will be permitted to continue after it has been brought to our attention.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, Congress should, and will eventually, enact legislation that will provide a sustenance for aged people who are without property or income sufficient to enable them to at least be provided with the bare necessities of life.

The minimum age, both in States wherein old-age pension laws have been enacted, and in the minds of legislators who have given this subject considerable thought, is 65 years. In my judgment, the limit should be reduced to 60 years. The reason for this suggested reduction is twofold. First, it gives the needy individual 5 additional years in which to enjoy, if he can, the fruits of hard toil and industry during the earlier years of his life. Hence, I choose to call all such measures as the one under discussion "old-age rewards." Second, under the system of government which has permitted ultra-rich individuals and wealthy corporations and trusts to accumulate 95 percent of the wealth of this country, under a system which has created a mortgaged and bonded indebtedness, public and private, of approximately \$230,000,000,000, largely controlled by the international Wall Street bankers and their fellow pirates, the mortgage-loan companies and 36-percent loan sharks, under a system which has resulted in massed finance, massed industry, and 10,000,000,000 idle men, it is impossible for a man 60 years of age to obtain work, even though he be able-bodied and willing to work.

The average longevity of persons reaching the age of 65 is about 11 years. Eleven short years of picking what few crumbs of happiness and contentment that may be gleaned from the festal boards of the modern Dives by the modern Lazarus. Surely, every human being reaching 65 is entitled to 11 short years of relaxation and contentment before being struck down by the withering hand of death.

In Ohio we passed, by a majority of 861,000 votes, an initiated old-age pension law at the November 1932 election. The funds to finance the pensions will be derived from the general revenue fund. It is estimated that approximately 14 percent of the aged population in Ohio will secure pensions; that the normal load of pension cost will not be reached until about 1938; and that in 1938 there will be nearly half a million people in Ohio who are 65 years of age and over. If 14 percent of the 482,000 aged pensioners in Ohio in 1938 receive a pension, there will be 68,908 pensioners on the rolls. If each of these pensioners receive \$25 a month, or \$300 a year, the annual normal cost of pensions in Ohio will be approximately \$20,000,000. This maximum pension load of nearly \$20,000,000 will not be reached until a pension law has been in effect for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, that a comparatively small class of the men are absorbing the wealth of the country as fast as it is produced, leaving to those who create it scarcely a bare subsistence, is apparent to all.

The people I plead for are the struggling masses, the farmers, the wage workers, small business men and producers, who for 45 years have toiled with hand and with brain, toiling away day by day, month by month, and year by year, creating the wealth of the country, paying the taxes of the country, to have that wealth accumulated by the favored few of special privilege and grand larceny.

During the recent winter, one of the severest in history, practically all of the opponents of old-age legislation were happy and comfortable in their own homes. They were warm. Yet thousands and tens of thousands of little children shivered because of the inability of their parents to buy coal or gas. People still are hungry in a land of plenty. People freeze in a country that abounds in coal and oil. People are homeless because there are too many homes. Ten million men are still unemployed because there are too many men who want to work.

What shall be done with these distressed people? Why, give them the reward of a fixed annuity or retirement when they become 60 years of age.

You who have a home, who sit by the warmth of your fire in winter, in the coolness of your spacious porch in the summer, who are blessed with an income, it is you who must be your brother's helper in this great crisis. It is easy to be happy and contented when you have a good job or a good income.

Someone has said:

It is easy enough to sail with wind and tide, to float over fair seas 'mid purple isles of spice, but the captain who goes down with his ship 'mid tempest dire, 'mid wreck and wrath, may be a far better and braver sailor than the master who rides his vessel safely to port with ensigns flying and rigging all intact.

'Mid the boast of heraldy and the pomp of power
And all that beauty, all that wealth, e'er gave.

It were easy enough to be a good citizen and a consistent patriot. But it is poverty and economic slavery, suffering and distress, sorrow and disappointment that try men's souls, that proclaim to the world the kind of stuff of which they are made.

Mr. Speaker, we seek to rescue and rehabilitate, with old-age pensions, the human derelicts beached on the sands of misery and despair by the tidal wave of legalized burglary, organized plunder, and bloody racketeering of the Morgans, the Kuhn-Loebs, the Mellons, the Wiggins, the Lamonts, and all the other high priests of the money aristocracy and scavengers of human misery.

Oh, we have clipped the claws and fangs of the Wall Street wolves. For the first time in the history of the country we have a President who has had the courage to tell Wall street to "go to hell" and stay there. Franklin D. Roosevelt is a humanitarian. He lives, thinks, and acts for

all the people. His heart throbs and his humanitarian motives are synchronized with those of the people who work for a living.

He has destroyed the pagan god of gold, worshipped by the Wall Street infidels. In comparison with the god of gold, the gods of Buddhism, Brahminism, Islamism, Confucianism are good and just gods. They are immutable gods. They can harm no one by themselves. But the god of gold is mutable. In times of great economic distress his ugly head rears itself from its golden shell, and like the sword of Damocles, hovers over the heads of the poor and distressed. His viperous tongue darts out at the unemployed worker and his home is gone. His fangs sink deep into the bankrupted farmer and he loses his farm. His sibilant hiss freezes in mortal terror the small business man and producer, until finally, like the human boa constrictor that he is, he destroys all of the debtor classes for the further enrichment of the capitalistic creditor classes.

Oh, they said it could not be done. They said we could not go off the gold standard. But the man of the hour, Franklin D. Roosevelt, like the mythical Hercules when he was invited by Antaeus, mighty giant and wrestler, son of Terra, the Earth, to grapple and wrestle in mortal combat, Hercules threw Antaeus repeatedly with ease, but each time when his feet came in contact with his Mother Earth, Antaeus arose with renewed vigor and energy, until finally Hercules seized Antaeus by the throat, raised him up, and strangled him in mid-air. Thus has our modern Hercules, Franklin D. Roosevelt, strangled the Wall Street money kings, and dragged them now and forever from their golden idol and pagan god, the gold standard.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has voiced his support of old-age pensions. Mrs. Roosevelt also heartily supports old-age pensions. So let us all join hands and fight for the old-age security of millions of men and women who have given their all for the supremacy of their country.

If we were to pass the proposed bill to benefit the aged of the District of Columbia without making the same provision for 120,000,000 people who are living elsewhere in this great country of ours, we would be guilty of a gross injustice to these 120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, without question, the residents of Washington, D.C., have suffered less during the depression than any other community in the land. With upward of 74,000 Government employees, most of them under civil-service rules and regulations, which means a life job and a life meal ticket, Washington hardly knew that a depression existed.

The Government has always been kind to the District of Columbia. The Franklin D. Roosevelt administration and the Seventy-third Congress have been exceedingly kind to the citizens of Washington; but we must all remember that those sturdy citizens on the rolling prairies of the Corn Belt, in the semiarid regions of the Northwest and Southwest, on the magnolia-bedecked plantations of the Southland, and on the rock-bound cliffs bordering the Atlantic are entitled to equal consideration, equal compensation, and equal justice.

Unfortunately this bill, if enacted, means an extension of unbearable and obnoxious bureaucracy, in that it confers unlimited power upon a commission to administer the law and the funds and to make appointments without consulting Congress or the President as to the number of such appointments to be made, the qualifications of individuals for said appointments, and the salaries to be paid those receiving appointments.

Of necessity, then, those of us who have the constituency of our districts and of our States uppermost in our consciences and our hearts must condemn the weaknesses herein mentioned.

What about the farmer who lost his farm? What about the unemployed home owner who had his home cast upon the bloody altar of the money lender? What about those of us who have a home and means of livelihood? How many of us can sleep soundly tonight, secure in the knowledge that when we reach the age of 60 we will have a roof

for shelter and an income sufficient to provide food and warmth for our bodies?

What about the father who wielded the pick, the shovel, the hammer, the saw, that communities might be built? What of the humble tiller of the soil who blazed the trail and made the desert to blossom as the rose?

What of the men who have gone down into the bowels of the earth to bring forth the natural resources for the enrichment of the coal barons, the copper kings, the oil monarchs, the steel magnates, and the electric-power barons.

What of those who have gone down into the factories and shops to feed the roaring blast furnaces, to operate the turning lathe, the punch press, the trip hammer, to become mere cogs in the mechanistic equipment of the gigantic industrialists, only to be kicked out like yellow dogs when they reach middle age. Oh, the Fords, the Schwabs, and other great industrialists boast of high wages and short hours. Yet, with their mammoth conveyor systems the strain is so great, the toil so devastating, that men are worn out and crushed at 45 and 50 years of age.

What shall we do with these millions of toilers, with this so-called "surplus" of men? We cannot plow them under as Secretary Wallace is doing with the farmer's cotton. We cannot advocate birth control, as Wallace advocates for pigs. These men are here. They have been potent factors in the upbuilding of a great Nation. There is one solution, and one only. Retire them at three score with a living compensation.

What about the aged mothers who have gone into the shadows of death that the captains of industry, commerce, and finance may have an ever-increasing supply of young men and young women to feed into the insatiable maw of swollen incomes and fortunes. What about this mother, who nursed at her breast and fondled on her knee the same blue-eyed boy and the same curly haired girl, as did the mother of the multimillionaire spawn?

What about those mothers who sent their boys to defend the honor and glory of our country—those boys, who crossed the tossing, foaming billows of the Atlantic, who went down into the blood-soaked trenches, who fought arm to arm and shoulder to shoulder, who heard the roar and shriek of the bursting shells, the yells and crying of the dying and wounded, who closed their buddies' eyes in that eternal sleep that knows no awakening, 3,000 miles away from home—those mothers, who fell down on their knees when the armistice was signed, who welcomed back home with outstretched arms and streaming eyes those boys?

Today, thousands of these boys are jobless, partially or totally disabled. Their pensions have been reduced. They cannot support the mothers who gave them to their country.

Should these fathers and these mothers, now in their declining years, be consigned to the poorhouse, or left to beg, starve, or steal? Is that the reward of the richest, the greatest, the most powerful nation the sun ever shone upon?

Today these distressed people are penniless—not through any fault of their own—but through the vicious system that has permitted 4 percent of the people to amass 96 percent of the wealth. These toilers, the backbone of the Nation, in war and peace, should be rewarded with a competence sufficient to enable them to spend their declining days in contentment and happiness. This reward should be paid for by those who have profited most from their slavery and serfdom—the capitalists.

Mr. Speaker, I propose a plan that will mean a decent living for every American citizen:

A DECENT LIVING FOR ALL

First. A capital-tax levy on all fortunes of \$1,000,000.

Second. Limit all incomes to \$100,000 per year.

Third. Tax all inheritances of more than \$1,000,000 95 percent.

Fourth. Enact the Truax moratorium bill and stop foreclosures of real estate.

Fifth. Pass the Frazier-Lemke bill to refinance farm mortgages at 3-percent interest, which includes amortization.

Sixth. Pay the soldiers' bonus with new currency, as provided for in the Patman bill recently passed by the House

of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. Pay off depositors in full in all closed banks, up to \$2,500.

Seventh. Nationalize the currency and credit. Restore the power to issue currency to the Congress of the United States.

Eighth. Enact old-age pension laws so that every aged person shall receive a minimum of \$30 per month.

Ninth. Tax wealth to the limit, to provide Federal relief funds, instead of issuing and selling tax-exempt bonds to the Wall Street bankers.

Tenth. Tax public utilities, the huge bank accounts of the millionaires, and the millions lent to farmers and wage-workers by personal-finance companies, commonly known as "36-percent loan sharks."

If we, as a nation, are to countenance and condone a system that creates classes—the strong and the weak, the educated and the illiterate, the high and the low, the rich and the poor—then the strong must lend a helping hand to the weak, the educated must inform the illiterate, the high are in duty bound to help the low, and the rich must take care of the poor.

A SUMMARY OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIAN AFFAIRS AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me by unanimous consent of the House, I take this opportunity, in view of my inability to visit the various communities of my district, to bring a brief summary of Choctaw-Chickasaw affairs and other matters to the attention of my constituents. As Congress has not yet adjourned, my official duties will not permit me to leave Washington.

As ranking member (or vice chairman) of the Committee on Indian Affairs, it has been my duty and privilege to secure important data direct from the departments, and to make a close study of Indian affairs. Since the Choctaws and Chickasaws are practically all located in the third district, which I have the honor to represent, I have spent some time in gathering and compiling definite data and figures to show the exact standing of these two tribes and their connections with the Government of the United States.

PER CAPITA PAYMENTS

Following is a list of per capita payments made to the Choctaws and Chickasaws to date, and the years in which those payments were made:

Year	Chickasaw	Choctaw
1904.....	\$40	\$40
1905.....	35	35
1908.....	20	20
1911-12.....	50	50
1914.....	100	
1916.....	200	300
1917.....	100	100
1918.....	200	200
1919.....	200	140
1920.....	100	100
1921.....	30	50
1924.....		25
1929.....		10
Total per capita.....	1,075	1,070

Number of Chickasaws participating.....	6,304
Total amount received by Chickasaws.....	\$6,776,800
Number of Choctaws participating.....	20,799
Total amount received by Choctaws.....	\$22,354,930
Total cash per capita payments to Chickasaws and Choctaws.....	\$29,031,730

The amount now on deposit with the Treasury Department to the credit of the Choctaws is \$101,966. Commissioner Collier says that after the salaries and expenses of tribal officers are paid, and other necessary funds are expended, it will be an insufficient amount to warrant a per capita payment at this time. (Indian schools are no longer maintained by tribal funds.) These payments have been made principally from accumulated coal royalties, and you will note that since 1918 the payments have gradually

diminished, owing to the discovery of a great wealth of oil and gas and a consequent drop in the coal business. Of course, the Choctaws and Chickasaws are not located in oil territory and have not reaped the riches from this source that the Creeks and Osages have. Therefore, anyone who tells the Choctaws and Chickasaws they have a lot of money and should have a per capita payment is either afflicted with colossal ignorance or is a demagogue of the first water, and is willfully and maliciously misrepresenting facts for political purposes. It is to be hoped that certain suits pending in the Court of Claims will be decided favorably at an early date. If so, the Choctaws and Chickasaws will get some money, but of course Congress has no part in the decisions of the Court of Claims.

INDIAN SCHOOLS REMOVED FROM TRIBAL FUNDS

When first elected to Congress, I promised to do what I could toward relieving the Choctaws and Chickasaws of the financial burden of keeping up their Indian schools. As soon as I had been in Washington long enough to have any influence, with the cooperation of Congressman HASTINGS, who is on the Appropriations Committee, we succeeded in getting Government appropriation for the maintenance and support of Jones Academy and Wheelock Academy in the Choctaw Nation, and Carter Seminary in the Chickasaw Nation, so they are no longer supported with tribal funds.

BILL TO SELL COAL LANDS

I have worked incessantly from year to year on my bill to sell the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal and asphalt deposits to the Government at the Government's appraised value, the proceeds thereof largely to be distributed in per capita payments, but the administration has always opposed it. I have secured passage of numerous bills to re-lease the coal lands, thereby replenishing the tribal treasury to some extent.

LEASED DISTRICT

In 1932 we were successful in securing passage through Congress of the Pine-Cartwright leased district bill, authorizing the Choctaws and Chickasaws to sue the Government in the Court of Claims for approximately \$7,000,000 in payment for certain western Oklahoma lands taken away from them in early days. Unfortunately, the bill was vetoed by President Hoover. But a special Senate resolution placed the claim in the Court of Claims for a finding of facts, where attorneys say it will be reported on before the next session of Congress. As Vice Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I shall be able to bring prestige and strong influence to bear on the final passage of this bill through Congress if it receives a favorable report from the Court of Claims.

OTHER CASES IN COURT OF CLAIMS

Numerous other cases totaling about \$32,000,000 in behalf of the Choctaws and Chickasaws are also pending in the Court of Claims. Some of these are about ready for trial and some are expected to be won. If and when they are won, the money is expected to be distributed in per capita payments. These claims, however, are out of the hands of Congress and in full charge of tribal and special attorneys.

\$400,000 REIMBURSEMENTS TO OKLAHOMA

Again, in cooperation with Congressman HASTINGS, I have aided in securing \$400,000 per year in reimbursements to the State of Oklahoma for nontaxable Indian lands. When I came to Congress the State was receiving only \$250,000 per year for nontaxable Indian lands, and much complaint was being made from certain school districts affected.

LET INDIANS HANDLE INDIAN AFFAIRS

It has always been my belief that Indians should hold Indian jobs, and that matters pertaining to the welfare of the tribes should be decided by the Indians themselves. It is therefore my policy to act on the the Wheeler-Howard administration measure as directed by the Indians of my district. I will say that recent amendments relieving the bill of certain strict and compulsory features have made it more acceptable, but I still find much opposition to it.

REPORT OF EMERGENCY CONSERVATION AND P.W.A. FUNDS ALLOTTED INDIANS OF MY DISTRICT

Following is a summary of the emergency conservation funds, road funds (P.W.A.), and construction funds (P.W.A.)

allotted to the various Indian agencies in my district within the last year:

Agency	Emergency conservation	Public Works construction	Public Works roads
Carter Seminary.....	\$1,350		
Choctaw and Chickasaw Sanitarium.....	30,000	\$23,400	\$3,000
Jones Academy.....	12,000	10,800	
Wheelock Academy.....	2,000	41,100	
Five Civilized Tribes.....	82,000	18,000	100,000

Out of the last-named item, funds are being used for such purposes as to establish subsistence homesteads for Indians, such as the project now being established at Wilburton, Okla., on 2,200 acres of tribal land, giving Indian families a chance to earn a livelihood in desirable surroundings with certain educational advantages. If these prove successful, more such projects will likely be established.

CONGRESSMEN ENTITLED TO COMMUNICATION WITH CONSTITUENTS

I have given you these facts and figures as valuable information on the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians and an outline of my endeavors to serve them as one of their representatives in Congress.

Fortunately, this United States Congress many years ago provided by law the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a bulwark for its Members against base misrepresentations made to the people back home by designing politicians, while Congressmen were busily engaged in their duties at Washington with no means of communication with their constituents except through the mails. It was found that highly respected and able Members of Congress, while hard at work in Washington, were being ruined by false charges down home, because they could not leave their posts of duty and had no means of keeping their records before the people. Therefore, they passed a law providing that any Member of Congress, by paying the full Government printing charges, could send excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the people in his district. My great trouble has been that owing to the tremendous amount of daily mail and business before the departments, my office clerks do not have time to send such material out, and in order to get it out occasionally, I must pay extra employees out of my own pocket, besides the printing charges.

MISREPRESENTATION AND ABUSE OF PUBLIC TRUST

Strange to say, such base misrepresentations and false charges often come from opponents who are holding public office, but who will neglect or desert that office and misuse their salaries, paid by the taxpayers, to travel around over the district and in public speeches lambaste and misrepresent the Congressman who is laboring 16 hours a day in Washington. This unfairness and abuse of public trust is going on in my district at the present time by opponents of mine who are holding public office, but spending their time at the expense of the taxpayers to the tune of \$3 and \$15 per day; proclaiming in public speeches such charges as, for instance, that I have my wife on the Government pay roll; that I voted to raise my own salary; that the Choctaws and Chickasaws have a lot of money and should be given a big per capita payment; all of which are either utterances of colossal ignorance or willful and malicious misrepresentations.

CHARGE WIFE IS ON PAY ROLL ABSURD

The charge that my wife is on the pay roll is too absurd to answer, because the records are wide open and anyone can see that she is not on the pay roll, and, although she works daily in my office, she does not draw a penny from the Government.

CHARGE VOTED TO RAISE SALARY FALSE

The statement made by Democratic Floor Leader BYRNS, found on page 6786 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17, 1934, should set at rest any doubt in the minds of the people on the salary-raising charge. Mr. BYRNS said:

I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I think we all realize that if we had not overridden the President's veto there would have been a full salary restoration on the 1st of July.

In other words, we voted to reduce our salaries rather than to raise them, but folks did not understand that until they had a chance to read the bills involved.

WOULD REPLACEMENT BE WISE?

I am doing the very best I can for the people of my district, and it is that confidence and esteem they show by returning me to Congress by overwhelming majorities that remunerates me for my work. It would take any new man, no matter how able and industrious he might be, at least 7 years of hard work and study to gain the influence and knowledge I now have of Government business. In case of my defeat, the State of Oklahoma as well as the Third District would lose the chairmanship of the Roads Committee in Congress; and the Choctaws and Chickasaws, particularly, would suffer the loss of the vice chairmanship of the Committee on Indian Affairs. Owing to the scramble among new members for committee assignments, it is doubtful if a new Congressman from the Third District could even get on one of these important committees, and then if he were successful in getting on one of them, he would be placed at the foot of the committee where it would take years to work up to a position of influence.

However, should the time ever come that my constituents would feel that another would give them better service as their representative at Washington, I feel safe in saying they would never choose a man who could not stand on his own merits. I think I know the good people of the Third Congressional District well enough to predict they will never honor a man who abuses public trust and who takes advantage of my absence from the district to besmirch my good name, falsify and misrepresent me. Anyone who will misrepresent facts to obtain an office will misrepresent the people if he gets the office.

Above all, I believe in honesty and hard work. I shoot straight from the shoulder, give the plain facts, and keep my promises. I know my record will stand the test.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the old-age-pension plan, now adopted by 28 States, has been given a sufficient test to demonstrate that it is the most practical and humane method of caring for aged, dependent people.

The District of Columbia adopted this principle a few years ago when three faithful horses, long connected with the fire department, were retired with a guaranty of food, shelter, and freedom from toil for the remainder of their lives, and again when it provided for dependent children by the mothers' pension plan, thus enabling them to be cared for in their own homes rather than to be placed in institutions at greater cost.

Dependent age and dependent youth should and does make a deep appeal to all of us. Those in between these two extremes usually can and do take care of themselves, except in periods of long-continued depression.

Alms-houses will always be needed for the care of certain persons unable to care for themselves, but the old-age-pension plan will enable us to avoid inflicting a punishment more dreaded than death upon worthy citizens who have spent the best part of their lives providing for others.

To imprison an intelligent, worthy citizen, simply because he is old and out of money, among the insane, the idiotic, the feeble-minded, and the incurable, in a county poorhouse should be classed among the cruel but unfortunately not unusual punishments prohibited by the Constitution.

Aside from all sentiment, however, and disregarding the established fact that the old-age-pension plan is the most humane method of providing for the aged dependents, there is a financial phase to be considered which should appeal to all of us who represent tax-paying constituents.

Aged people who are in need must and are being cared for, either through public funds or private charity. The old-age-pension plan does not put an additional burden on the taxpayer, but, as the following table indicates, where adopted it has materially lessened the cost of this phase of relief.

State	Average annual pension	Average annual cost of poorhouse care per inmate ¹	Saving to taxpayer per pensioner
California.....	\$275.28	\$484.12	\$208.84
Delaware.....	113.91	495.62	381.71
Idaho.....	132.21	528.52	396.31
Kentucky.....	60.00	295.95	235.95
Maryland.....	332.38	459.79	127.41
Massachusetts.....	312.00	539.33	227.33
Minnesota.....	192.36	631.86	439.50
Montana.....	158.35	634.19	475.84
Nevada.....	300.00	649.16	349.16
New Hampshire.....	232.79	503.72	270.93
New Jersey.....	177.60	479.86	302.26
New York.....	302.88	405.59	102.71
Utah.....	116.76	512.33	395.57
Wisconsin.....	236.04	390.99	154.95
Wyoming.....	170.66	908.68	738.02

¹ The poorhouse statistics are taken from a report of the most recent poorhouse investigation by the United States Department of Labor. They include the cost of maintenance, plus the annual investment cost of the buildings and land figured at 6 percent. Depreciation has not been included.

I quote briefly the following facts cited by the Old Age Security Herald and append hereto a table showing chief provisions of the principal old-age pension laws in the United States compiled by the national old-age pension commission for the Fraternal Order of Eagles:

1. Old-age pensions have been definitely established as the cheapest form of relief.
2. Public leaders, officials, and newspapers, formerly opposing this form of relief, are now favoring it.
3. The old-age pension law is working out better than any other plan heretofore tried for rendering aid to old persons from public funds.
4. Self-reliance and greater independence, not pauperization, has resulted from the adoption of old-age pension laws.
5. The prediction that old-age pension laws would remove the terrors of the poorhouse and lead to the eventual abolishing of most of those relics of barbarism, is being borne out by pension experience.

Chief provisions of the principal old-age pension laws in the United States

Compiled by the National Old Age Pension Commission for the Fraternal Order of Eagles. The first old-age pension law in the United States was introduced by Lester H. Loble, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and member of the Old Age Pension Commission of the State of Montana.

State	Year of law	Kind of law	In effect	Residential qualifications	Property qualifications	Age limit	State jurisdiction	How administered	Funds, how raised	Pensions, how paid	Maximum amount of pension allowed
Calif.....	1929 (revised 1931)	Mandatory	Jan. 1, 1930.	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 15 years; county, 1 year.	Value of applicant's property (or combined property of husband and wife) must not exceed \$3,000.	Years 70	Division of State aid to the aged (created in State department of social welfare).	County board of supervisors.	By county levy...	State pays one half of pension (but not more than \$180 a year), county pays other half.	\$1 a day.
Del.....	1931	do	July 1, 1931.	United States residence, 15 years; State, 5 years.	No limitation; but if additional property is acquired by aged person or his or her spouse, pension may be canceled or amount varied.	65	Vested in State old-age welfare commission; Governor to receive annual reports.	State old-age welfare commission.	Beginning July 1, 1931, \$200,000 appropriated annually for 2 years out of general funds of State treasury.	State pays entire amount.	\$300 annually; in no case to exceed \$25 a month.

Chief provisions of the principal old-age pension laws in the United States—Continued

State	Year of law	Kind of law	In effect	Residential qualifications	Property qualifications	Age limit	State jurisdiction	How administered	Funds, how raised	Pensions, how paid	Maximum amount of pension allowed
Idaho...	1931	Mandatory...	May 5, 1931.	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 10 years; county, 3 years.	Applicant's income must not exceed \$300 annually.	Years 65	State department of public welfare.	Probate judge under supervision of county commissioners.	Paid from poor fund or county current expense fund.	County paid...	\$300 annually; in no case to exceed \$25 a month.
Mass...	1930	do.	July 1, 1931.	State, 20 years.	Applicant's income and value of property not specified, but are to be considered, together with ability of children and others to support aged person, in determining need of pension.	70	Department of public welfare.	Town boards of public welfare.	Tax of \$1 on males 20 years old, or older, levied 1931 for 2-year period.	State pays entire amount.	Not specified, but amount shall be sufficient to provide suitable and dignified care.
Minn...	1929 (revised 1931)	County option.	1929	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 15 years; county, 15 years.	Value of applicant's property (or combined property of husband and wife living together) must not exceed \$3,000.	70		County commissioners, with special provisions in counties having boards of public welfare or poor commissions.	County levy. City, town, and village also levy annual tax.	City, town, and village to reimburse county for pensions paid to their 5-year residents.	\$1 a day.
Mont...	1923	do.	1923	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 15 years.	Applicant's income must not exceed \$300 annually.	70	State auditor to receive annual reports.	County commissioners.	County levy.	County paid...	\$25 a month.
N.H...	1931	Mandatory...	Sept. 1, 1931.	United States citizen, 15 years; county, 15 years.	Value of applicant's property (or combined property of husband and wife living together) must not exceed \$2,000.	70		County commissioners.	County treasurer to pay pensions unless otherwise arranged with proper officials of towns and State. Town and State officials whose duty it is to furnish assistance are authorized to make such agreements with commissioners as shall make purposes of act effective.	Counties to pay pensions in first instance; to be reimbursed by city or town legally chargeable for such assistance.	\$7.50 a week.
N.J...	1931	do.	Jan. 1, 1932, pensions granted July 1, 1932.	United States citizen; State residence, 15 years; county, 1 year.	Applicant's real or personal property not to exceed \$3,000.	70	Division of old-age relief (created in department of institutions and agencies).	County welfare boards.	Inheritance tax ¹ .	State pays 75 percent, county pays 25 percent.	\$1 a day.
N.Y...	1930	do.	May 1, 1930, pensions granted Jan. 1, 1931.	United States citizen; State residence, 10 years; public welfare district, 1 year.	Applicant must be unable to support himself or be without children or other person able to support him and responsible for such support.	70	Division of old-age security. (Created in State department of social welfare.)	Public welfare district officials (a city forming part of a county public welfare district may elect to furnish aid to its residents.)	By levy in public welfare district; State's share included in executive budget of department of social welfare.	Public welfare district to provide relief in first instance; to be reimbursed by State for one half of the amount.	Not specified, but relief granted should be sufficient to provide for pensioner.
Utah...	1929	do.	1929	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 15 years; county, 5 years.	Applicant's income must not exceed \$300 annually.	65		Board of county commissioners.	County levy.	County paid...	\$25 a month.
Wis...	1931	Mandatory (replaces county option law of 1925).	Jan. 1, 1932, pensions July 1, 1933, under mandatory law.	United States citizen, 15 years (or born in United States); State, 15 years; county, 15 years.	Value of applicant's property (or combined property of husband and wife) must not exceed \$3,000.	70	Annual reports to be filed with State board of control and secretary of state.	County judge under supervision of board of control.	County levy; each town to levy tax if required.	County pays two thirds; State, one third (county may cause towns to reimburse it for county's share).	\$1 a day.
Wyo...	1929	Mandatory...	June 1, 1930.	United States citizen, 15 years; State, 15 years; county, 5 years.	Applicant's income must not exceed \$360 annually.	65	State auditor to receive annual reports.	Board of county commissioners.	County levy.	County paid...	\$30 a month.

¹ Governor required to budget annually, and legislature required to appropriate from receipts of inheritance-tax department, sufficient sum to pay State's share. After this pension appropriation is made, \$12,000,000 from the inheritance receipts shall be set aside for general State purposes. All surpluses over these two amounts shall be placed in a capital fund, until such fund alone will yield interest sufficient to pay all the State's share of old-age relief. Each county board of freeholders will annually appropriate a sum sufficient to pay county's share.

SUBSISTENCE HOMESTEADS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of Subsistence Homesteads and to include therein an answer made to Dr. Wirt by the First Lady of the Land, also a telegram I sent to her and a copy of a letter she received from the Morgantown real-estate board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following newspaper article quoting Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in answer to charges of Dr. Wirt; also a telegram, and letter

relative to charges of Dr. Wirt against subsistence homestead projects:

WIRT CHARGES BRING ANSWER BY FIRST LADY—DEFENDING SUBSISTENCE HOMES SHE ASKS "WHEN HAS WORK BEEN HELD COMMUNISTIC"

Shattering tradition that the First Lady should avoid controversies, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt yesterday struck back vigorously at Dr. William A. Wirt in defense of the subsistence homestead projects which he labeled "communistic."

Mrs. Roosevelt said:

"Dr. Wirt said that the Reedsville project was communistic and would take 200 families out of Morgantown who are now paying rent in Morgantown and would therefore mean that taxes would be harder to collect and would upset the general economic situation in town.

FEW RENT PAYERS

"I should like first of all to point out that not many, if any, of the people who eventually will move into the 125 houses instead of 200 have paid any rent for quite a long while. Most of them were on relief or they would not have been employed there or had an opportunity to say they would like to move out there.

"I hardly think it would be found that people on relief were paying much, if any, rent. Most of them were out of mining camps and I doubt if mining camps will feel that they are losing any rent from these people.

"I do not understand how he considers it communistic to give people a chance to earn their own living and to buy their own houses. It is a fact that the Government will provide the initial capital, but I hope that many private enterprises will do it, for the Government is simply attempting to point the way for what may be done by many industries throughout the country in the future.

DROP IN BUCKET

"Never in this country, to my knowledge, has it been considered communistic for an opportunity to be given to people to earn their own living and buy their own houses.

"What the Government is doing in this homestead project is but a drop in the bucket in a big country like this, and its value, while it may be helpful to a few people, really lies in the suggestion it is making to the industry of the country that by decentralizing and moving out of large cities, it may make it possible for great numbers of people to have more in their lives than they otherwise would have."

[Telegram]

Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,

The White House, Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my sincere admiration and approval for the courageous answer you have made to what I believe to be unfair and faulty criticism by Dr. Wirt relative to the subsistence homestead program under way among stranded population groups in our Nation. The Roosevelt administration is actually planning in behalf of humanity. These mountaineers of West Virginia have been down for the count of 9, but through your active interest and that of the new deal leaders these discouraged folk will stand on their own feet again and not continue to be kept on an unsatisfactory dole which destroys initiative. As First Lady of the land, let me assure you that you are first in the hearts of the men and women of the West Virginia hills whom you are aiding. When you visit them on June 7 they will again express their gratitude.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 21, 1934.

Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,

White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: Our local real estate board has learned through newspaper reports of the testimony of Dr. Wirt before the congressional committee which is investigating his charges, that Dr. Wirt said the removal of 200 families to Arthurdale would greatly disturb the economic situation in Morgantown, especially in reference to real estate. This is somewhat amusing to us.

So far as we have been able to learn, but one family accepted for the Arthurdale project, resides in Morgantown. If every family accepted had come from Morgantown the result would be a relief in the housing situation. There is at this time a distinct shortage of small homes here which we see no way to relieve until mortgage money for construction is available.

If Dr. Wirt's accusations have generally no more basis in fact than the specific part here referred to, they do not, in our opinion, deserve serious consideration.

Very truly yours,

THE MORGANTOWN REAL ESTATE BOARD,
By R. C. SMITH, President.

ELECTION CONTEST—ELLIS V. THURSTON

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted a report in the contested-election case of *Lloyd Ellis v. Lloyd Thurston*, from the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa (Rept. No. 1305), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

ELECTION CONTEST—LOVETTE V. REECE

Mr. HANCOCK of New York, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, submitted a report in the contested-election case of *O. B. Lovette v. B. Carroll Reece*, from the First Congressional District of Tennessee (Rept. No. 1306), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8617) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. How long will this take? It seems to me this request comes rather late in the day.

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not think it will take very long.

Mr. SNELL. The committee should have risen earlier if we were to consider this conference report today.

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman from New York that there are two or three matters of emergent necessity in this conference agreement that should be taken care of at once. There is no controversy to speak of with regard to the conference report.

Mr. SNELL. It is a privileged matter; but I say that as a general proposition a conference report should not be called up at this late hour. If a conference report is to be brought in, the committee should rise earlier to give proper time for consideration of the report. Why cannot this matter be put over until tomorrow noon?

Mr. LUDLOW. If the gentleman insists, it can be done.

Mr. SNELL. I cannot insist, for it is a privileged matter.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think it can be disposed of very briefly. As I say, there are some urgent matters in the bill, some appropriations, for instance, in which the State Department is greatly interested, to equalize pay of employees in the Foreign Service. This is important, and it is of emergent necessity.

Mr. SNELL. Do the minority members of the conference committee know the gentleman intends to call it up at this time? Who are they?

Mr. LUDLOW. They are the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLeop] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Sinclair]. I called up their offices, but they were not there.

Mr. SNELL. As I pointed out, we are acting hurriedly in this matter. I think it ought to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is no difference between the conferees. As far as I am aware we are unanimous.

Mr. SNELL. I think the minority members of the conference committee should at least be given the opportunity of being here.

Mr. LUDLOW. As I said, I notified their offices, but they did not happen to be in.

Mr. SNELL. I am not going to object, but I am bitterly opposed to bringing up conference reports at this late hour of the day.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. GOSS. I will withhold it for a moment; yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. May I ask the gentleman from New York if he contemplates maintaining his position in reference to the matter?

Mr. SNELL. I have made all the statement I care to make. It is too late in the afternoon to call up a conference report. I think the gentleman should have given notice or else have taken them up earlier in the day.

A 12-POINT PROGRAM

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein an address delivered by Hon. Homer Cummings, Attorney General of the United States, before the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

Madam President General, ladies, and gentlemen, permit me, at the outset, to express my deep appreciation of the honor you have done me in inviting me to address the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is not only a delightful privilege in itself, but it affords me an opportunity to renew, in very pleasant fashion, a semi-official tie of long standing between the Department of Justice and the D.A.R. The history of your society records that, shortly after its organization in 1890, the national board of management selected as its first legal adviser a distinguished lawyer of St. Louis, the Honorable George H. Shields, who was, at that time, an Assistant Attorney General during the administration of President Harrison.

Since its inception your society has devoted itself with enthusiasm to patriotic causes. You have, as enjoined by your constitution, truly perpetuated the memory and the spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence. You have erected monuments to commemorate those whose heroic deeds have lighted the fires of patriotism within the hearts of the American people. You have caused to be introduced into the public schools patriotic exercises to celebrate the anniversaries that are closely connected with our national history. You have sponsored the writing of essays upon historical subjects. You have carried on educational work among applicants for naturalization, to the end that they might be instructed regarding the great figures and the important events of American history. You have sponsored legislation to protect the dignity of the flag from disrespect at the hands of the thoughtless and the irreverent.

In these ways, and by many other means, you have consistently stimulated disinterested service and fostered reverence for the glorious traditions of our Nation. By so doing you have made a vital contribution to the public welfare; for, as an ancient Greek statesman once said, "Through admiration of what is heroic, men rise to higher levels."

Therefore, knowing full well your devotion to our common country and your deep concern for its welfare, I speak to you tonight of certain matters of wide and immediate importance.

The suppression of crime has become a national problem of the first magnitude. Hundreds of millions of dollars are expended each year in efforts to arrest, to prosecute, and to restrain the criminal classes. Moreover, large sums are spent annually by private individuals and corporations in the maintenance of guards and industrial police forces and for insurance against loss by criminal acts. The yearly toll exacted of society by predatory criminals, in the form of property destroyed, values converted, money stolen, and tribute enforced, constitutes a ghastly drain upon the economic reserves of the Nation. Undoubtedly crime costs our country several billion dollars each year, and it is conservative to say that there are more people in the underworld carrying deadly weapons than there are in the Army and the Navy of the United States.

Clearly the institutions and agencies upon which we have relied for the enforcement of the law have not adequately performed their proper functions.

In many localities there exists an unholy alliance between venal politicians and organized bands of racketeers.

Then, too, certain unworthy members of the bar maintain a close contact with the criminal classes and prostitute an honorable profession by resorting to improper practices in order to save their clients from the legitimate consequences of their crimes.

These recreant members of the legal profession take skillful advantage of the cumbersome and archaic procedural rules governing criminal cases which still persist in many of our jurisdictions. Trials are delayed, witnesses die or disappear, and appeals upon frivolous grounds are all too frequent.

As Mr. Justice Holmes once very shrewdly observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

In many parts of the country law enforcement officers are not selected primarily because of their training and general qualifications, but are given positions on a basis of political preferment. Where this is true, each change of political administration is accompanied by a reorganization of the local constabulary. It is impossible to build up an efficient and courageous force of officers so long as they are constantly subject to the whims of political fortune.

Another difficulty grows out of the unfortunate situations which result from a lack of cooperation so often characteristic of the activities of the various law enforcement agencies of the country.

Another serious phase of the problem has to do with the relative uncertainty which exists with respect to the dividing line between the jurisdictions of the Federal and State Governments. Here lies an area of relative safety—a twilight zone—in which the predatory criminal takes hopeful refuge.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States there was little need that the Federal Government should concern itself with the problem of crime. Due to the isolation of the different settlements, the operations of criminals were, of necessity, local in their nature. You will recall that when John Adams first went from Boston to Philadelphia, his wife, the famous and delightful Abigail Adams (who, by the way, has been called the "patron saint of the D.A.R."), made note of the fact that it took 5 weeks to receive a return letter from that "far country."

We are no longer a nation whose problems are local and isolated. The growing density of our population and the develop-

ment of high-speed methods of transportation have resulted not only in a large increase in our crime rate but also have given to many offenses an interstate character. As a celebrated American jurist has said, "The maintenance of an organized society has come to involve much more than repression of local offenders against local laws. Where 100 years ago the chief concern was the common defense against foreign aggression and savages, today it is rather a common defense against organized, antisocial activities extending beyond State lines, operating without regard to political boundaries and threatening any locality where there is possibility of plunder or profit."

Crime today is organized on a Nation-wide basis, and law-breakers extend their activities over many States. In a well-remembered kidnapping case, which occurred during the past year, the operations of the criminals took place in 7 States; and it was necessary for the agents of the Department of Justice to go into 9 additional States in their successful efforts to solve the crime and bring its perpetrators to justice. The seven States referred to have an area of about 683,000 square miles, which exceeds in extent the combined areas of Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, England, Scotland, and Wales. This illustration indicates the extent of the difficulties involved and accentuates the need of Nation-wide approach to the problem. The Federal Government has no desire to extend its jurisdiction beyond cases in which, due to the nature of the crime itself, it is impossible for the States adequately to protect themselves. In response to this manifest necessity, and entirely within constitutional limitations, the Department of Justice is urging the Congress to pass certain important bills now pending before that body, as follows:

First. A law dealing with racketeering which will make it a felony to do any act restraining interstate or foreign commerce, if such act is accompanied by extortion, violence, coercion, or intimidation.

Second. A law making it a Federal offense for any person knowingly to transport stolen property in interstate or foreign commerce.

Third. Two laws strengthening and extending the so-called "Lindbergh kidnapping statute."

Fourth. A law making it unlawful for any person to flee from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding prosecution or the giving of testimony in felony cases.

Fifth. A law making it a criminal offense for anyone to rob, burglarize, or steal from banks operating under the laws of the United States or as members of the Federal Reserve System.

Sixth. A law making it a criminal offense for any person to kill or assault a Federal officer or employee while he is engaged in the performance of official duties, and a law to provide punishment for any person who assists in a riot or escape at any Federal penal institution.

Seventh. A law to make the husband or wife of a defendant a competent witness in all criminal prosecutions.

Eighth. A law to limit the operation of statutes of limitations by providing that such statutes shall not prevent the prompt reindictment and prosecution of a person after a prior indictment has been held to be defective, and a law to prevent dilatory practices by habeas corpus or otherwise.

Ninth. A law to provide that testimony on behalf of the defendant to establish an alibi shall not be admitted in evidence unless notice of the intention of the defendant to claim such alibi shall have been served upon the prosecuting attorney at or before the time when the defendant is arraigned.

Tenth. A law to repeal the statutory provision which has been held to prohibit comment upon the failure of the accused to testify in a criminal case.

Eleventh. A law to regulate the importation, manufacture, or sale, or other disposition, of machine guns and concealable firearms.

Twelfth. A law authorizing agreements between two or more States for mutual cooperation in the prevention of crime.

This is the 12-point program of the Department of Justice. I not only invite your attention to it—but I solicit for it your earnest support.

I believe that thus it will be possible for us to observe the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and, at the same time, work out a better and more effective system of crime control.

It is seemingly that we should venerate the heroes of the Revolutionary period; and that we should honor the patriots whose courage and daring have added luster to our flag. At the same time we should remember that we are now engaged in a war that threatens the safety of our country—a war with the organized forces of crime. It is an undertaking of serious import and constitutes a test of our citizenship and of our capacity for successful self-government. In this fight your organization can render valiant service.

You can, if you will, direct your efforts toward the building up of a stout-hearted public morale which will cause citizens, as a matter of course, promptly to furnish to the officers of the law the information that may come to them regarding known fugitives from justice, to give testimony freely in criminal cases, and to render jury service gladly when opportunity is afforded to perform this high function of American citizenship. You can help in putting an end to the maudlin glorification of the gangster, which has at times disgraced our public thinking and has led to episodes like that which recently occurred at Crown Point.

You can aid in speeding the activities of police and prosecutors, in enabling courts to establish proper rules and practices, and in

securing desirable laws from State legislatures and from the Congress.

No more worthy enterprise could possibly engage your attention. A serious danger faces this country. Organized bands of criminals prey upon legitimate business, exact tribute from the timid or the fearful, and constitute an ever-present threat not only to property but to the safety of our homes and the sanctity of life. This open challenge to orderly government must be met with a courage worthy of our intrepid ancestors.

To this sacred cause I urge you to devote your thoughts and dedicate the energies of your great organization.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the wishes of the gentlemen on the other side, for whom I have the highest regard, I withdraw the request to take up the conference report at this time, but I serve notice now that I shall call up this conference report the first thing tomorrow. In calling up the report I did not have the slightest intention or desire to take advantage of anyone. It was simply that we might make progress because of the emergencies involved.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE ON FOREIGN WAR DEBTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on the subject of foreign war debts and increased armaments of war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the British Government last week announced that it was making no provision in its budget this year to pay any of the principal or interest due the United States on war debts. That means that England is again defaulting on these debts, although a magnanimous Congress several years ago and before I was a Member extended the time of payments over a period of 60 years and also granted her request of the outright cancellation of more than a billion dollars of England's debt to America on the assurance that Great Britain would pay her future installments of principal and interest promptly. It is needless to add that she has broken faith in her failure and refusal to do so.

This House only a few days ago passed a reciprocal tariff bill at the suggestion of the President in order to show our good faith toward foreign governments, in the hopes that such a bill when enacted would create better trade relations between the United States and foreign nations, more especially those who owe war debts and claim they have been unable to pay because of our tariff policies. As a reply to our magnanimous attitude toward these foreign governments, France has also indicated she will follow England's lead in refusing to pay any part of the principal or interest this year on her debts due the United States.

PROPAGANDA OF INTERNATIONAL BANKERS

During my four terms in Congress there has hardly been a week in any session that some Member of this body with an international complex has not risen in his seat to pay a glowing tribute to France, England, or some other foreign government. A majority of these speeches have been pleas for cancellation of foreign war debts due the United States. It has been somewhat amusing to hear Congressmen who never have set foot on foreign soil speak in this Chamber and before the committees about "poor poverty-stricken France."

Others have lauded France to the skies for staying on the gold standard, and have praised her financial system as being far superior to that of the United States. This sounds like propaganda from the international bankers, who predicted disaster and business stagnation when the President very wisely took the United States off the gold standard.

Mr. Speaker, I have no animosity toward France or any other foreign government; but as I have stated on this floor many times, I am not an internationalist. Neither am I in sympathy with all the propaganda in and out of Congress by half-baked economists, political opportunists, supporters and apologists for the Hoover administration, and would-be statesmen who worry more about the affairs of the Old

World than they do of the many perplexing problems facing our own people of America.

It will be recalled that during the Hoover administration many self-admitted economists and supposed-to-be statesmen were telling the country that our terrible financial and business catastrophe could not be avoided because of world conditions. Yet, under the able leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, it must be admitted that America is gradually, slowly but surely, pulling out of the depression, while world conditions apparently are becoming more complicated. Recent events in Austria, China, France, and other nations beyond the seas would indicate this to be true.

SHOULD STAY OUT OF ENTANGLING ALLIANCES IN EUROPE

Having spent many months in France several years ago in doing my very humble part to make the world safe for democracy, and having visited France and some of the other countries of Europe in recent years, where I went as a representative of Congress to world-peace conferences, I have been especially interested in the manner in which European countries have handled their problems. I am becoming more and more convinced that America should henceforth and forever stay out of entangling alliances with the Old World. But we should do more than that. We should quit trying to emulate France or other unfriendly and unappreciative foreign governments.

We are told by the international bankers and their henchmen, big and little, that America must cancel all foreign war debts in order to assure better trade relations. That is the burden of the argument of all of those advocating outright cancellation, whether they be the Wall Street bankers, with millions of foreign securities, or their spokesmen in and out of Congress. As I recall, this is some of the same argument used back in December 1931, when former President Hoover asked Congress to declare a year's moratorium on all war debts. In opposing that moratorium bill then on the floor of this House, I predicted that such action by Congress would not help trade relations but would only leave the impression with foreign nations that this Government does not actually expect European countries ever to pay the debt they owe us—a debt they contracted when they had their backs to the wall and could not borrow a dime elsewhere on the face of the earth.

PASSED MORATORIUM AT BEHEST OF BIG BUSINESS

In addressing this House in opposition to the Hoover moratorium bill, known as "House Joint Resolution 147", on December 18, 1931, I said in part:

If you will examine the RECORD you will find that almost the identical argument that has been made on this floor today and for the past week in favor of this alleged 1 year's postponement was made by some of the same leaders here a few years ago in favor of cancellation of a major portion of war debts due America by other nations. Be it remembered that 51 percent of the French debt and 74 percent of the Italian debt was canceled in order that America might show her brotherly love and play the part of the good Samaritan to those supposedly impoverished nations. We were also told that it would be a valuable aid in helping France and Italy to prosper, and that their prosperity would be indirectly reflected in America, and that our magnanimity to France and Italy would mean a revival of business in the United States. Congress was also assured that France and Italy were to reduce their armaments of war. Both nations prospered to considerable extent by our overgenerous move, and neither nation felt obligated to keep faith with America. Did trade with either France or Italy improve? No; both nations went across to the cut-rate store—Russia—and began buying their cotton, wheat, and other supplies that they were morally obligated to buy from the United States. Did either nation reduce its armaments of war? Oh, no; but, on the other hand, both France and Italy have decidedly increased their standing armies, their navies, and increased their appropriations for aircraft. In short, France and Italy took Uncle Sam, the big-hearted Santa Claus, on a "snipe hunt" and left him holding the sack.

The Congress granted that moratorium. The international bankers, who had inspired the whole scheme, collected some of their private loans to European countries at the expense of this Government. Did business conditions improve? It is well known that they did not improve especially in America, despite the glowing promises and enthusiastic predictions made on this floor when the Hoover moratorium was pending.

World conditions also continued to grow worse. The slump in America developed into a panic and on the 4th day of March, 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated as President, practically every bank in this land was closed. It was the darkest page in American history.

Then came the new deal. The bankrupt policy of internationalism was thrown overboard and America, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, is emerging from the chaos and ruin that had thrown the country into bankruptcy, left millions of homeless, hungry people, and more than 12,000,000 heads of families without jobs. No one pretends to say that the country is fully out of the woods but, as the President has so aptly said, "we are on our way." Yet few of those gentlemen here who boast of their international complexes will claim that conditions are growing better in the European countries.

BOMBARDMENT HAS BEGUN AGAINST CONGRESS

Just now Republican leaders in Congress and a few bitter, partisan newspapers with a Wall Street complex, have begun their bombardment of criticism and vilification of the President and the Congress. Some of these same Republican leaders promised faithfully to cooperate as a loyal, patriotic duty at the beginning of this session but have decided, as the coming campaign approaches, to be bitter partisans rather than patriotic citizens. Some of the same leaders and big daily newspapers who were calling on Democrats to support the Hoover moratorium, the infamous Hoover program of farm relief, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and declared, with so much eloquence, it to be the patriotic duty of Members of this House to do so against one's own convictions, are leaders in a concerted movement now to discredit the Congress as well as our great President and his entire program. Some of them have the nerve and audacity to tell us we ought to return to the era of internationalism, otherwise known as the "Hoover administration." President Roosevelt as well as this Congress, that has generally followed his leadership, no doubt has made mistakes and probably will continue to do so in the future. But I am firm in my conviction that the great heart of our beloved President beats in sympathy with the toiling masses and that under his able leadership this country shall never be turned over to the money changers and international bankers. [Applause.]

UNCLE SAM PLAYS ROLE OF SANTA CLAUS

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again today what I have said on the floor of this House many times, that I favor the payment in full of the balance of the foreign war debts due the United States. I am opposed to so-called "token payments", or bad-faith gestures under the disguise of good will on the part of ungrateful foreign governments. Our people are becoming weary of watching Uncle Sam continue to play the role of Santa Claus to Europe. They are tired of seeing the greatest peace-time armies in the world being financed in Europe with dollars that belong to the American taxpayers.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. These same countries that owe us war debts, instead of trying to pay the war debts, have increased their armament to the amount of nearly \$2,000,000,000 annually.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true. Instead of cooperating and showing good faith, they have begun to build up their standing armies to an alarming degree. Only recently, France announced that she proposed to construct 8,000 of the fastest and most powerful airplanes in the world, yet she pleads poverty in justification for her failure and refusal to pay any part of the debts she owes this country.

Mr. Speaker, if Europe really has any good will for the United States and desires to show as much as a spark of appreciation to the American people, I would suggest that a practical way of showing to the world her sincerity of purpose would be by reducing, rather than substantially increasing, her standing armies, navies, and aircraft. Let her

come to the United States with clean hands. Let her lower her unreasonable trade barriers that have excluded practically all products of the American farmer. But let it never be said that this Government would go so far as to cancel Europe's war debts and thus aid in building up the greatest military forces the world has ever seen for ungrateful and unfriendly nations across the sea. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman withhold her motion just a minute?

Mrs. NORTON. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO ANNAPOLIS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was accepted:

APRIL 23, 1934.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On account of unexpected matters just developed that prevent my attendance, I hereby resign from the position to which appointed of the Visitors' Board to Annapolis.
Very sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FREAR.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CADY, for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. CLARK of North Carolina, for several days, on account of being a witness in important litigation.

To Mr. HAMILTON, for today, on account of important business.

To Mr. LANHAM, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. SWICK (at the request of Mr. DARROW), for this week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. THURSTON (at the request of Mr. DOWELL), on account of death in family.

To Mr. VINSON of Kentucky, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5075. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1910, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Tuesday, Apr. 24, 10:30 a.m.)

Room 328, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(Tuesday, Apr. 24, 10 a.m.)

Hearings for the consideration of H.R. 8172 and S. 2835. Hearings to be in the committee room.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

402. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers of the Army renewing a former recommendation for legislation for the relief of the heirs of Mr. Burton S. Adams, formerly a civilian employee of the War Department, who lost his life in the performance of his duty, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims (H.Doc. 420).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BROWN of Michigan: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7908. A bill to promote resumption of industrial activity, increase employment, and restore confidence by fulfillment of the implied guaranty by the United States Government of deposit safety in national banks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 325. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1936, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8714. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S.C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8908. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., and a point opposite thereto in Union County, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETTENGILL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8937. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Delphi, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8951. A bill authorizing the city of Shawneetown, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near a point between Washington Avenue and Monroe Street in said city of Shawneetown and a point opposite thereto in the county of Union and State of Kentucky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8958. A bill authorizing the city of Wheeling, a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at Wheeling, W.Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9000. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Holtwood, Lancaster County; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9257. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Bainbridge, Lancaster County, and Manchester, York County; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 350. Resolution for the consideration of S. 752; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER: Committee on Elections No. 1. House Report 1298. A report in the contested-election case of *McAndrews v. Britten*. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 282. Joint resolution requiring 50 percent of the cargo imported and exported under trade agreements between the United States and foreign nations to be carried in vessels of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. H.R. 5266. A bill to amend section 4548 (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 605) of the Revised Statutes of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. H.R. 8639. A bill to repeal certain laws providing for the protection of sea lions in Alaska waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H.R. 9241. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to award 1-year contracts for carrying air mail, to establish a commission to report a national aviation policy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H.R. 7212. A bill to remove the limitation upon the extension of star routes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER. Committee on Elections No. 1. House Report 1305. A report in the contested-election case of *Ellis v. Thurston*. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Committee on Elections No. 1. House Report 1306. A report in the contested-election case of *Lovett v. Reece*. Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 224. Joint resolution to retire George W. Hess as director emeritus of the Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK: Committee on Military Affairs. H.R. 4440. A bill to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker and Calton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9205) prescribing tolls to be paid for the use of locks in the Ohio River and its tributaries, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H.R. 9278) providing for a survey of the Chehalis River from the mouth of the Skookumchuck River extending up the Chehalis River to the Ocean Beach Highway Bridge at Riverside Park, Chehalis, and to the deep water of the Chehalis River at the Grays Harbor County line, Washington; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H.R. 9279) to liquidate and re-finance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system through the use of the Federal farm-loan system, the Federal Reserve

Banking System, and creating a board of agriculture to supervise the same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H.R. 9280) relating to deposits in the United States of public moneys of the government of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLDEN: A bill (H.R. 9281) to apply the quota system to immigration from the Republic of Mexico and the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H.R. 9282) authorizing the establishment and maintenance of an industrial plant at Reedsville, W.Va.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H.R. 9283) to provide for the designation of beneficiaries by employees subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD (by departmental request): A bill (H.R. 9284) to authorize the addition of certain names to the final rolls of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request): A bill (H.R. 9285) to provide for the appointment of deputy collectors of the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H.R. 9286) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city of Albany, N.Y., for a public park or other municipal purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H.R. 9287) authorizing the county of Pierce, a legal political subdivision of the State of Washington, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Puget Sound within the county of Pierce, State of Washington, at or near a point commonly known as "The Narrows", and repealing the act approved February 28, 1929; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H.R. 9288) to amend the act approved April 13, 1934, known as "Public Law No. 160", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETTE: A bill (H.R. 9289) to amend paragraph 5 of section 771, title 12, United States Code, supplement VII, United States Code, and subsection (b) of section 1016, title 12, United States Code, supplement VII, United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H.Res. 350) for the consideration of S. 752; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Resolution (H.Res. 351) to appoint a special committee to investigate the proposed textbook code; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMM: A bill (H.R. 9290) for the relief of Martha Palitis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLLINS of California: A bill (H.R. 9291) for the relief of Bessie L. Fenn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H.R. 9292) granting a pension to Joseph M. Caughmam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEMKE: A bill (H.R. 9293) for the relief of Otto C. Asplund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H.R. 9294) for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H.R. 9295) granting an increase of pension to Hester A. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9296) granting a pension to Frances E. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9297) granting a pension to Mary A. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9298) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9299) granting a pension to Mary Ann Eskew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9300) granting a pension to Frances E. Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9301) granting a pension to James E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9302) granting an increase in pension to Sarah McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9303) granting a pension to Famie Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9304) granting a pension to Mary E. Mecomber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9305) granting a pension to Ella Strutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to Sallie A. Nunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Ida Nagel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9308) granting a pension to Ruah L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9309) granting a pension to Mary M. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9310) granting an increase of pension to Jeritha Love Claxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9311) granting a pension to Nan A. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4143. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Senate and Assembly, State of New York, urging Congress to amend the Securities Act of 1933 by eliminating certain provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4144. Also, petition of Genesee-Jefferson Business Men's and Taxpayers' Association, Inc., Buffalo, N.Y., urging enactment of the Cartwright bill; to the Committee on Roads.

4145. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the members of St. Joseph's parish, of Ronkonkoma, N.Y., favoring the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4146. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution unanimously adopted by the members of St. Joseph's parish, Ronkonkoma, N.Y., favoring the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4147. Also, letter from the United Umbrella Workers Union, Local No. 19164, American Federation of Labor, New York City, favoring the Wagner-Connery Disputes Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4148. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the St. Bernard's Branch of the Holy Name Society, New York City, urging an increase of broadcasting time for station WLWL and favoring amendment to section 301 of the Radio Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4149. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of Holy Name Society of the department of sanitation, Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, room 914, Municipal Building, Brooklyn, N.Y., protesting against the action of the Radio Commission in discriminating against and cutting down the allotment of hours for station WLWL to such an extent that it interferes with its religious, cultural, and educational program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4150. By Mrs. CLARKE of New York: Petition of William F. Flagg and family, and Yo Bryn and family, of Springfield Center, N.Y., favoring an amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4151. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing the proposed imposition of a 1 day's furlough each month on certain employees in the Postal Service of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4152. Also, resolution of the City Council of Revere, Mass., favoring House bill 7986, pertaining to radio broadcasting; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4153. By Mr. DIES: Petition of O. D. Baker, of Orange, Tex., and numerous other citizens of Texas, endorsing the old-age pension bill and urging an immediate vote on this bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4154. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the members of the Children of Mary Sodality of St. Mary's Parish of the city of Yonkers, N.Y., signed by Rev. John J. Dyer, pastor, urging the adoption of amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4155. Also, petition of the Westchester County (N.Y.) District Council, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, signed by John Connelly, secretary, protesting against the United States participating in the League of Nations or in the World Court of the League of Nations, with or without reservations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4156. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the executive committee Tannersville Chamber of Commerce, Tannersville, Greene County, N.Y., on Tuesday, April 17, 1934, favoring enactment of Senate bill 3171 for Federal regulation of motor carriers, introduced by Senator DILL March 23, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4157. By Mr. IMHOFF: Petition of G. C. Davis and other citizens of Wellsville, Ohio, and surrounding communities, urging passage of the McLeod bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4158. By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: Resolution by the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, urging the immediate passage of legislation to give farm refinancing at a rate of interest not higher than 3 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4159. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of the District of Columbia, urging passage of measure for relief of needy blind; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4160. Also, petition of 1,018 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against furloughs and curtailed service in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4161. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Council on April 6, 1934; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4162. Also, resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of California, on March 25, 1934; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4163. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of residents of Freeborn County, Minn., urging emergency relief measures for providing for the unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4164. Also, petition of Oscar I. Mongeau Post, No. 742, American Legion, Marshall, Minn., expressing sorrow at the passing of John Simpson, the national president of the Farmers' Union, and urging the enactment of the Frazier bill, which he sponsored; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4165. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Holy Name Society, department of sanitation of Brooklyn and Queens, N.Y., Rev. Leo A. Arcese, spiritual director, favoring the proposed amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 as contained in House bill 8977; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4166. Also, petition of the United Umbrella Workers Union, Local No. 19164, American Federation of Labor, New York City, favoring the passage of the Wagner-Connery bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4167. Also, petition of Walter Parker, of New Orleans, La., concerning the Fletcher-Rayburn securities bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4168. Also, petition of the Welfare Association of the Blind, Youngstown, Ohio, urging support of the Dunn bill (H.R. 8751); to the Committee on Labor.

4169. Also, petition of the Central Union Label Council, New York City, favoring the Wagner-Lewis unemployment insurance bill and the Wagner-Connery Disputes Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4170. Also, petition of All Saints Roman Catholic Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., Rev. John M. Mulz, pastor, favoring the proposed amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4171. Also, petition of Upholsterers, Carpet, and Linoleum Mechanics International Union of North America, New York City, favoring the Wagner-Connery bills and the Wagner-Lewis bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4172. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition of the Westchester County (N.Y.) District Council, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, protesting against the United States participating in the League of Nations and World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4173. By Mr. RICH: Resolutions of St. Bernard Rectory of Bradford, Pa., favoring amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4174. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., endorsing the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4175. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., endorsing the so-called "McLeod bill"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4176. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the United Umbrella Workers' Union, Local No. 19164, American Federation of Labor, New York City, favoring the passage of the Wagner-Connery Disputes Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4177. Also, petition of Holy Name Society of the department of sanitation, Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, city of New York, Rev. Leo A. Arcese, spiritual director, favoring the proposed amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 as contained in House bill 8977; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4178. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Memorial of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., urging enactment of the McLeod bill (H.R. 8479), providing for the pay-off of depositors in closed banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4179. Also, petition of H. E. Neal, of Smiths Creek, Mich., and 51 others, urging the enactment of legislation providing for the pay-off of depositors in all closed banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1934

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Apr. 17, 1934)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brown	Copeland	Fletcher
Ashurst	Bulkley	Costigan	Frazier
Austin	Bulow	Couzens	George
Bachman	Byrd	Cutting	Gibson
Bailey	Byrnes	Davis	Glass
Bankhead	Capper	Dickinson	Gore
Barbour	Caraway	Dieterich	Hale
Barkley	Carey	Dill	Harrison
Black	Clark	Duffy	Hastings
Bone	Connally	Erickson	Hatch
Borah	Coolidge	Fess	Hatfield